THE EUCHARIST
Law and Practice

DURIEUX–DOLPHIN

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

THE EUCHARIST

(*Law and Practice*)

BY

Canon P. Durieux

Doctor of Theology and of Canon Law
Secretary to the Bishop of Le Puy

TRANSLATED BY

Rev. Oliver Dolphin
Faribault, Minn.

WITH A FOREWORD BY

Most Reverend Austin Dowling, D. D.
Archbishop of St. Paul

For Sale by the Translator
Rev. Oliver Dolphin
Faribault, Minn.

NIHIL OBSTAT

St. Paul, Minn., March 4, 1926.
ALOISIUS ZISKOVSKY,
Censor Deputatus.

IMPRIMATUR

St. Paul, Minn., March 4, 1926.
✠ AUSTIN DOWLING,
Archbishop of St. Paul.

Copyright, 1926
BY REV. OLIVER DOLPHIN
Faribault, Minn.

The Lakeside Press
R. R. DONNELLEY & SONS COMPANY
CHICAGO

DEDICATED
TO HIS EMINENCE
GEORGE CARDINAL MUNDELEIN, D.D.

WHOSE ACTIVITIES
IN BRINGING THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS
TO HIS METROPOLITAN CITY HAVE
GIVEN A TREMENDOUS STIMULUS TO THE
DEVOTION OF PRIESTS AND PEOPLE TO
JESUS
IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

FOREWORD

BOOKS which deal with the Blessed Sacrament are usually devotional or liturgical. Outside of formal theology, few are written exclusively for priests. This little book, however, will make its strongest appeal to priests. Its questions are such as priests ask. Its answers—always in conformity with the Canons of the New Codex,—are such as priests are most interested in receiving. It should be very welcome to our clergy, and when its merits are known will doubtless have a large circulation among them. It will be another one of those handy little manuals like "THE BUSY PASTOR'S GUIDE," which our confreres in France produce so readily and with such admirable precision for the instruction and the guidance of priests the wide world over.

✠ Austin Dowling,
Archbishop of St. Paul.

St. Paul, Minn., March 4, 1926.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/eucharist0000unse_g1p9

Letter of Monseigneur Boutry, Bishop of Le Puy

Bishop's Palace, le Puy.

Le Puy, Dec. 15, 1924.

Dear Canon:

The volume of three hundred and some pages which you have just published under the title of "l'Eucharistie," resembles, in its method of treatment, your recent work, "Le Mariage en droit canonique." The readers of that other work will surely purchase this one.

You have not thought of launching out on the *"mare magnum"* of profound theology, and your book is neither a dogmatic treatise on the adorable Sacrament of the altar (altho it omits nothing that is essential), nor a mystical work. Writings of that class abound, and many of them are excellent. You have striven to produce what did not hitherto exist, "a canonical and practical summary," intended particularly for priests who, because they are Its consecrators, dispensers, or guardians, are constantly in touch with the Holy Eucharist.

All that bears on the accidents which are always to be apprehended in the celebration of Mass, all that refers to the matter, the fast, the Communion, the linens, the sacred vessels and vestments, the tabernacle, is set forth with as much clarity as doctrinal competence. You are thus saving your confreres in the priesthood the trouble of making researches which would often demand a great deal of time just when a speedy solution was required, and which would often be unavailing, since neither manuals nor folios contain decisions and decrees issued after their publication. For in practice, even tho the essence of the sacraments is immutable, the discipline is subject to change; and this is particularly true with regard to the Eucharist. We know how Pius X strove

to facilitate its reception by the faithful, by the children and the sick in particular. Hence there have been important changes in the legislation regarding the age, the fast, the frequency of receiving; and also precious pronouncements as to the necessary dispositions.

No pastor, no director of souls can excuse himself from knowing these changes. Where, moreover, is the priest who is not eager to bring to the celebration of the sacred mysteries the knowledge without which he would expose himself to the danger of falling into deplorable errors?

You have, then, my dear Canon, accomplished one of the most useful of works, and I would gladly see your book in the hands of every priest.

Accept, my dear Canon, together with my congratulations, the assurance of my affectionate regard.

✠ Thomas Francois,
Bishop of Le Puy.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

IT IS not a dogmatic or ascetical treatise, but rather a collection of practical recommendations that we present to our readers. We have collated them in particular for the use of priests who are engaged in parish work. The book may also be of some service to pious souls who, without pretending to sound the depths of the Eucharistic mystery, desire nevertheless to have precise ideas concerning it, and who wish above all to know the rules laid down by the Church to insure to Our Lord, present on our altars, the respect and the honor that are due Him, and to enable the faithful to derive from the Sacrifice and the Sacrament the graces that are contained therein.

The recent legislation has not modified the treatise on the Eucharist so profoundly as it has that on Marriage. Nevertheless, we all realize the importance of the regulations concerning the Communion of children, the Communion of the sick, Frequent Communion, Mass stipends, the Eucharistic fast, etc. On these different matters, and also on those which have not suffered any change, we have endeavored to present, briefly but very carefully, the doctrine of the Church and the teaching of the best theologians, in such fashion as to furnish reliable guidance in the chief difficulties that may arise concerning the celebration of the sacrifice and the administration of the sacrament. We have not been able to go into much detail concerning the regulations of the liturgy; but we have called attention to some of them which have a particular bearing on our subject.

While adopting the didactic form, which is a trifle dry, but is more precise, and which is the only form which meets the purpose we have in view, we have not thought it advisable to give the work a scientific appearance by corroborating our assertions by refer-

ences to the sources from which they were taken. We believe, however, that we can say that we have not made any questionable statements; when occasion demanded, we have expounded the contrary or divergent opinions, but we have always tried to recommend the doctrine which seemed most in conformity with the teachings of the Holy See.

The Eucharist is the center of Christian life; it is still more truly the center of the priestly life. The priest is, in a very special manner, the man of the Eucharist; it is the Eucharist which gives him that incomparable dignity which exalts him above the angels; it is the Eucharist which imposes his principal duties upon him. We shall be very happy if these pages will be the means of helping some of our brethren to better realize their ideal, by reminding them of some of their more serious obligations and by augmenting their esteem for all that touches on the honor due to this divine Sacrament.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword by His Grace Most Reverend Austin Dowling, D.D., Archbishop of St. Paul.

Letter of Mgr. Boutry, Bishop of Le Puy.

Preface of the Author.

Dedication to Cardinal Mundelein.

PART FIRST

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

PAGE

Chapter I.—The Nature and Efficacy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice 19
Article I.—The Nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.... 19
Article II.—The Fruits of the Eucharistic Sacrifice..... 24
Chapter II.—The Priest and the Eucharistic Sacrifice..... 31
Article I.—The power to consecrate..... 32
Article II.—The power to apply the fruits of the Mass.. 35
1:—How the application of the Mass is effected..... 36
2:—To whom the fruits of the Mass may be applied.. 38
3:—The Mode of application of the fruits of the sacrifice to the souls in Purgatory..... 41
Chapter III.—The Obligation of Celebrating Mass..... 43
Article I.—Obligation resulting from the priesthood.. 45
Article II.—Obligation resulting from an office to which the care of souls is attached..... 46
Article III.—Obligation resulting from the acceptance of a stipend 52
Article IV.—Foundations of Masses..... 67
Article V.—The Reduction and Condonation of Masses. 70
Chapter IV.—The Dispositions Required of the Celebrant... 72
Article I.—Bodily Dispositions 72

PAGE
Article II.—Spiritual Dispositions 78
Article III.—The Server of the Mass..... 82
Article IV.—The Celebret 83
Chapter V.—The Time for Saying Mass..... 85
Article I.—The days for saying Mass..... 85
Article II.—Plurality of Mass,—Bination..... 87
Article III.—The time for saying Mass..... 92
Chapter VI.—The Place for Saying Mass..... 94
Article I.—The church 94
Article II.—Oratories 98
Article III.—Celebration in a non-sacred place..... 101
Article IV.—The altar 102
1:—Concerning the altar in general..... 102
2:—The privilege of the Portable Altar..... 105
3:—The Privileged Altar..... 106
4:—The Gregorian Altar, and the Gregorian Masses.. 108
Chapter VII.—Objects Necessary for the Sacrifice..... 111
Article I.—The sacred vessels..... 111
Article II.—The sacred linens..... 113
Article III.—The sacerdotal vestments..... 115
Article IV.—The furnishings of the altar..... 118
Chapter VIII.—The Matter and Form of the Eucharist..... 123
Article I.—The Matter..... 123
1:—Conditions for the validity of the matter..... 124
(1) the bread..... 124
(2) the wine..... 125
2:—Conditions for the liceity of the matter..... 126
(1) the bread..... 126
(2) the wine..... 128
3:—The water added to the wine..... 130
Article II.—Consecration of the Eucharistic Matter.... 130
1:—Conditions for validity..... 130
2:—Conditions for liceity..... 132
Article III.—The Form of the Eucharist..... 133
Chapter IX.—The Liturgy of the Mass..... 134
Article I.—The Rite and the Quality of the Mass.... 134
Article II.—The Rubrics 140
Article III.—The Continuity of the Mass..... 145

PART SECOND

The Sacrament of the Eucharist

	Page
Chapter I.—The Nature and Effects of this Sacrament	151
Article I.—The Nature of this Sacrament	151
Article II.—The Effects of this Sacrament	153
Chapter II.—The Minister of the Sacrament	157
Article I.—The Ordinary Minister	157
Article II.—The Extraordinary Minister	161
Chapter III.—The Right and the Duty to Receive Communion	162
Article I.—Concerning Communion in General	162
Article II.—The Right to Receive Communion	165
Article III.—The Duty to Receive Communion	170
1:—Obligation of divine law	170
2:—Obligation of ecclesiastical law	171
3:—Communion as Viaticum	174
Chapter IV.—Dispositions Required for Communion	176
Article I.—Spiritual Dispositions	176
Article II.—Bodily Dispositions	178
1:—The natural fast	178
2:—Other dispositions	182
Article III.—The Communion of Children	184
1:—The age for Communion	185
2:—The decision as to the dispositions of the child and his admission to the Holy Table	188
3:—The obligations of the parents, the confessor, the pastor, etc.	190
Article IV.—Frequent and Daily Communion	192
1:—The Doctrine	192
2:—The required dispositions	193
3:—The role of the confessor	195
4:—Practical conclusions	197
Article V.—Dispensation from Fasting, for the Sick	200
Chapter V.—Concerning the Administration of Holy Communion	203
Article I.—The obligation of Giving Communion	203
Article II.—The Place and the Time for Communion	204
Article III.—The Distribution of Holy Communion	206

PAGE
1:—General rules 206
2:—The rite of Communion 208
3:—The rite for Communion of the sick 211
Chapter VI.—Concerning the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament 214
Article I.—The Obligation and the Permission to reserve the Blessed Sacrament 214
Article II.—Prescriptions regarding the Reserved Sacrament 218
1:—The altar 218
2:—The tabernacle 220
3:—The key of the tabernacle 222
4:—The ciborium 223
5:—The sanctuary lamp 224
6:—The renewal of the Sacred Species 225
Article III.—The Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament .. 227

The Eucharistic Mystery

1. "In the Eucharist, under the species of bread and wine, Our Lord Jesus Christ is contained whole and entire, is offered up as a sacrifice, and is received as food" (c. 801). The *Codex* sets forth in these few words the twofold aspect of the Eucharistic mystery, at one and the same time sacrifice and sacrament; sacrifice, because Our Lord, coming down upon the altar, renews His immolation on Calvary unto the glory of His Father; sacrament, inasmuch as it contains the body and blood of Christ to serve as a spiritual food for our souls.

It has been customary hitherto to study the Eucharist as a sacrament before considering it as a sacrifice. We have adopted the opposite order, both because it is in conformity with the *Codex,* and because it is the more logical. For on the altar Our Lord immolates Himself for the glory of God, before giving Himself to us in Communion. These are, however, two aspects of one and the same mystery; the consecration which produces the sacrament is also the formal cause of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Underlying these various considerations there is, first of all, the capital dogma of the Real Presence of Our Lord under the species of bread and wine. And it may not be amiss to once more state briefly this foundation of the whole doctrine that we are about to consider.

2. It is an article of divine and Catholic faith *(Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, c. 1 & 4)* that Christ is whole and entire,—that is, His body, His soul, and His divinity,—truly, really, and substantially present in the Eucharist; and this, not only at the moment of Communion, but as soon as the words of consecration are pronounced.

There is no need of proving this doctrine, which is clearly enunciated in many texts of Holy Scripture and of Tradition.

Let us content ourselves with saying that the presence, under the sacramental species, of the various elements of the person of Our Lord, is explained by a twofold principle; some of these elements are present by virtue of the words of consecration *(vi verborum)*, the others, because they are inseparably united with them *(per concomitantiam)*. When the priest says: "This is my Body," it is the power of the words themselves which makes the Body of Christ to be present in the Eucharist; but since this body is a human body, informed and vivified by the holy soul of Jesus hypostatically united to the person of the Word, it follows that by concomitance the blood, the soul, and the divinity of Our Lord are also present in the Host.[1]

3. As to the means employed by Christ to make Himself present in the Eucharist, they consist in the conversion of all the substance of the bread into His Body, and of all the substance of the wine into His Blood. It would be a heresy to deny this conversion and to maintain the persistence of the substance of the bread and wine together with the Body and Blood of Jesus *(Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, c. 2)*.

The best word to express this conversion, a word which is, moreover, consecrated by the teaching of the Church, is "transubstantiation." It indicates very well the total change of one substance into another.[2]

---

1. The same remark applies to the consecration of the species of the wine. It follows from this doctrine that Communion under only one species gives us Our Lord whole and entire. On the contrary, if, while Jesus was in the tomb, the Apostles had made use of the power received by them at the Last Supper, and had consecrated bread alone, there would have been under the species of the bread only the Body of Our Lord, a bloodless and inanimate body, altho still hypostatically united to the Word.

2. Catholic doctrine compels only the discarding of all those opinions which admit the permanence of the substance of the bread after the words of consecration, and the believing in the change of this substance into the substance of the Body of Christ, the latter taking the place of the former under the persisting appearances.

But the theological notion of transubstantiation establishes, moreover, an essential and intrinsic connection between the disappearance of the bread and the appearance of the Body of Our Lord. It would be manifesting a very imperfect understanding of it, to explain it as by the succession of two distinct acts, the annihilation of the bread, and the adduction of the Body of Christ or its substitution for the substance of bread by any sort of a union with the accidents. Succession is not conversion.—Transubstantiation is accomplished by one single act of God; this act affects only the substance of the bread, in such fashion that all the being that is in that substance passes into what there is of being in the substance of the body of Christ, and, as an im-

4. It follows from this doctrine that the species of bread and wine, after the consecration, remain without being supported by any substance whatsoever. For on the one hand, nothing remains of the substance of the bread and wine; and on the other, it is impossible that the accidents should inhere to the Body and Blood of Our Lord. These accidents, then, exist without any subject, by a miracle of God's power.[3] This has always been the teaching of the Church. *(Cat. Rom., de Sacr. Euch., c. VI, No. 5.)*

Let us now proceed to study this presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist, first as a sacrifice, secondly as a sacrament.

---

mediate and necessary consequence, effects the presence of the Body of Our Lord under the accidents, which acquire, with reference to the substance of that divine Body, the relation of container to the thing contained, which relation they formerly possessed with reference to the substance of the bread (cf. Gihr, The Sacraments, II, p. 86).

3. St. Thomas declares that this miracle consists in this, that God supernaturally preserves the *quantity* of the bread without any subject. This accident thus possesses a separate existence apart from its substance. But previously quantity was the subject of all the other accidents, form, color, taste, etc.; after the disappearance of the substance, it continues to be their support, and plays the role of substance with reference to them. (Sum. theol. IIIa, q. 77, a. 2).

PART FIRST

The Eucharistic Sacrifice

CHAPTER I.

The Nature and Efficacy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

Here again, it is not a part of our plan to consider those important questions which pertain to the realm of dogmatic theology. We shall be content with recalling briefly certain fundamental principles the knowledge of which will help us to understand the prescriptions of the *Codex*.

Article I.—The Nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

5. The Notion of Sacrifice in General.—A sacrifice is the act *par excellence* of the virtue of religion; it sums up in itself, as it were, the worship which we owe to God. It may be defined as *"the offering of a sensible thing which represents human life and is substituted for it, to God by a lawful priest for the purpose of acknowledging His sovereign dominion over creatures, by means of the real or equivalent destruction of the above-mentioned sensible thing."*

Sacrifice can be offered only to God, for its direct and immediate signification is to acknowledge the sovereign dominion of the Creator over all things, and our dependence on Him,[4] a dependence which goes so far as to demand the giving up of our life and of our whole being. This offering can be made only by a lawful minister, that is, one designated by public authority. And it must be followed by a transformation of the thing offered, a transforma-

4. This direct signification does not exclude, but on the contrary includes the other significations, or the other ends of the sacrifice. Since God is our sovereign Master, we should acknowledge that all blessings come from Him, and we should consequently give Him our thanks for the blessings we have received, ask Him for further blessings, and, in the hypothesis of sin, confess our guilt, avow that we are deserving of the punishment of death, and strive to appease the divine justice.

tion which separates it from its ordinary use and involves its formal or equivalent destruction.[5]

6. Sacrifice varies according to the manner of offering or the purpose of the offerer. It is bloody or unbloody, according as the object offered is or is not susceptible of bloody destruction.

Its purpose may be to express the submission of a creature to God (latreutical sacrifice), or to thank God for His gifts (eucharistic sacrifice), or to implore His grace (impetratory sacrifice), or to appease God's justice angered by our sins (propitiatory sacrifice). And the same sacrifice may have all of these characteristics at one and the same time.

As regards the efficacy of the sacrifice, it may come from the pious dispositions of the priest *(ex opere operantis)*, or from the intrinsic value of the sacrifice itself, that is, from the dignity of the victim offered (*ex opere operato*), or from both these principles together. In the Old Law, the Mosaic sacrifices produced of themselves only a legal purification; their sanctifying power depended on the dispositions of the priests and of the faithful.

---

5. The definition of sacrifice in general is very useful to help us to understand in what the formal reason of the Sacrifice of the Mass consists. The importance given by an author to one of the elements of the sacrifice naturally leads him to emphasize that element as the essential point in the Eucharistic sacrifice. Discussion amongst theologians turns chiefly on the "real or equivalent" destruction of the thing which is offered in sacrifice.

In his "*Mysterium Fidei,*" which is replete with novel and profound considerations, Pere de la Taille adopts this definition of sacrifice: "A sacrifice is the *sensible oblation* of a victim that is truly immolated" (p. 303). For him, the notion of sacrifice does not demand *actual* immolation. Hence the Mass would consist essentially in the *ritual oblation* of Christ truly present on the altar, placed by His Passion in the condition of a victim, and by His glorification in the condition of a victim perpetually accepted by God.

This opinion departs from the traditional doctrine according to which the victim must be placed in the condition of an immolated victim, *by virtue of the sacrificial act itself;* if the consecration is not an immolation of Christ, it is not easy to see how the Mass is a true sacrifice.—For without this note of real or equivalent destruction, it is difficult to see any difference between a simple oblation or offering, and that specific oblation which is a sacrifice. Attention was called to this by St. Thomas, altho some have wrongly thought that he did not include a destruction of the thing offered in his notion of sacrifice. "The term 'oblation,'" he said, (2. 2. q. 86, art. 1) "is applied in common to all things that are offered for the worship of God. If the object is offered unto divine worship to be made a sacred thing, *destined to be consumed,* there will be at one and the same time an oblation and a sacrifice; if, on the other hand, the thing is offered so that it remains intact, even tho it is consecrated unto divine worship or to the use of the sacred ministers, it will be an oblation and not a sacrifice."

In a thesis "*De essentia SS. Missae sacrificii*" (in 8vo. xv-536 pp.), published in Louvain in 1919, M. Lamiroy gives this definition of sacrifice: "An oblation intended to acknowledge the sovereign dominion of God by means of the destruction of human life or of a sensible thing representing human life and substituted for it, which destruction is effected by a legitimate ministry" (p. 102). This is almost identical with the traditional definition deduced from the comparative study of the sacrifices of the Old Law, from meditation on the sacrifice of Calvary, and from various indications scattered thru the history of religions.

7. The Sacrifice of the Mass.—It is a truth of faith that in the Mass[6] a true and properly so called sacrifice is offered to God. *(Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, c. 1.)*

Moreover, this sacrifice, the only one in the New Law, has replaced all the sacrifices of the Mosaic Law. "The Mass," says the Council of Trent, "is that pure oblation which was typified by all the ancient sacrifices, whose consummation and perfection it is. It contains in itself all the blessings which were signified by the sacrifices of the Old Law. It is at one and the same time a sacrifice of adoration, of thanksgiving, of impetration, and of propitiation." This last point has been especially defined by the Church: "Let him be anathema who sees in the Mass only a sacrifice of praise, or a simple commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross; let him be anathema who says that the Mass is not a sacrifice of propitiation, that it should not be offered up for the living and the dead, for the sins, the punishments, the satisfactions, and the other necessities of the faithful" *(Sess. XXI, c. 3).*

The Mass, therefore, is a true sacrifice, but it has an intimate relationship with the Sacrifice of the Cross; it repeats and renews[7] the Sacrifice of the Cross, in accordance with the command given by Our Lord to his disciples. "In the Mass," says the Council of Trent, "the unbloody victim is the same Christ who was offered in a bloody sacrifice on the Cross. Therefore the Victim and the Priest are the same, altho with accidental differences (on the Cross Christ was passible and mortal, on the altar He is impassible and immortal; on the Cross Christ was the only priest visible, at the altar the priests of the Church are the ministers of the invisible Christ); it is the manner of making the offering that establishes an important difference between the two sacrifices." For the Mass is an unbloody sacrifice.

Moreover, the purpose of the Mass is to obtain for us the application of the satisfactions and merits of the Sacrifice of the

---

6. The Mass derives its name from the twofold dismissal uttered in olden days by the deacon during the course of the sacrifice, the first after the Mass of the Catechumens, the second at the end of the reunion: *Ite, missa est* (for *missio, dimissio*), i.e., Go, it is the dismissal.—The name of a portion of the ceremony has been given to the whole ceremony; the portion was unimportant in itself, but it established a precise distinction between the hearers of the Mass, according as they were permitted to remain until the first or until the second dismissal.

7. According to P. de la Taille, the Mass renews, not the immolation of Christ on the cross, but rather the ritual oblation of the victim as Christ did it at the Last Supper. But according to the council of Trent (XXII, c. 1), the sacrifice of Our Lord was accomplished on the cross; and it is this sacrifice which the Mass is to represent and to renew in an unbloody manner.

Cross. On Calvary Our Lord redeemed mankind by presenting to His Father all the satisfactions demanded by all the sins of all humanity; the mass makes it possible for each individual to receive his share of this general satisfaction.[8] It is, therefore, essentially related to the Sacrifice of Calvary.

8. The Essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass.—The opinion that is commonly held today[9] makes the essence of the sacrifice of the Mass consist solely in the consecration of the species, considering, at the same time, the communion of the priest as necessary for the integrity and the extrinsic perfection of the sacrifice.

For the consecration is the only act in the Mass that is truly performed by the priest in the name of Christ whose instrument he is, the only act that represents the Sacrifice of the Cross by the mystical separation of the Body and the Blood of Our Lord. It contains, moreover, all the elements which enter into the definition of a sacrifice.[10] Nevertheless, the special character of the Eu-

---

8. "The Mass is the immolation of a God who is, as it were, put into our very hands, in order that we may take the share that is ours, in the time, under the circumstances, in the measure, and for the end determined by Providence." (Monsabré, 70th Conference.)

9. There is hardly an exception amongst modern authors. Certain former opinions held that the sacrifice consists in the communion of the priest, or in the elevation, or in the breaking of the Host, or in the mixture of the species, etc.

10. It is not a part of our plan to study at great length the manner in which this destruction of the victim is effected in the Mass. It is a question that is warmly debated amongst theologians. Amongst the most profound opinions are the following: 1:—The opinion of Lessius, Gonet, Billuart, who see the formal reason of the sacrifice in the *sacramental* separation of the body and the blood; the consecration, they say, taking into consideration only the meaning of the words, truly tends to separate the body and the blood of Christ; it is only *per accidens* that this result is not achieved. 2:—The opinion of de Lugo, Franzelin, and many others, who find a sufficiently marked immolation in the state of inferiority in which Christ is constituted by the consecration, since, under the sacred species, he is reduced to the condition of food and drink. (We have seen above that the opinion advanced by P. de la Taille does not require this *actual* immolation.)

Against the opinion of Lessius, the objection is urged that it makes the consecration a vain attempt at the real immolation of the Saviour; we must admit that if there is no real immolation, there is no sacrifice.—Against de Lugo, it is objected that the fact that an object is reduced to a condition of food has never been looked upon as a sacrifice, and moreover, this condition of food and drink does not in any manner recall the bloody sacrifice of the cross. And therefore Cardinal Billot, while admitting the principle of Lessius, proposes a slightly different explanation; according to him, the *sacramental* separation of the body and blood, the *mystical mactation* of Christ, is enough to constitute a sacrifice, for it puts Christ, under the sacramental species, in an *external* condition of an immolated victim, and it conveys, as perfectly as the real destruction of a victim, *the symbolic meaning peculiar to sacrifice.* Considering only the meaning of the words of consecration, they represent Jesus immolated, "the Body on one side, the Blood on the other, and each under different symbols" (Bossuet). This mystical mactation represents very definitely the death of Christ on the cross, and contains the whole symbolical signification of the honor that we wish to give God thru sacrifice.

M. Lamiroy adheres to this opinion, but accentuates one of its elements; besides the sacramental condition of Christ produced by consecration, he requires on the part of the priest an interpretative intention (*ordinatio intentionalis*), desired and formu-

charistic sacrifice, in which the victim is offered under the species of bread and wine, requires the partaking of the victim, that is, the communion, as the complement of that act which makes us enter into so close a relationship with God. In olden days, in the sacrifices of the Old Law, the priests had to eat a portion of the victim; and yet this partaking was not looked upon as an essential part of the sacrifice. It was, as it were, a consequence of the oblation, and it was likewise a figure of Communion. Most authors look upon this communion *of the priest* as required by divine law.

9. Practical Conclusions.—1. It follows from this doctrine that presence at the consecration of the Mass is enough to entitle one to a share in the essential fruits of the Sacrifice of the Mass. It does not, however, satisfy the precept of the Church.

2. The same host must be used for the consecration and for the communion of the priest; for the priest is bound to partake of the sacrificial victim that he has just offered. Moreover, it is not allowed, unless for a very grave reason (v.g., to bring Viaticum to a dying person), to give Communion to the faithful before the Communion of the priest, with hosts which the celebrant has just consecrated; for the priest should partake of the sacrifice before the faithful.

3. It has been asked whether the consecration of the two species is essential to the Eucharistic sacrifice. Practically all the modern authors answer in the affirmative; for Christ gave the command to the Apostles to consecrate under two species. And this is the only means of representing in expressive fashion the bloody sacrifice of Calvary, and of realizing the priestly type of Melchisedech, who offered both bread and wine.

The contrary opinion has little to support it.[11] And in practice it is absolutely forbidden to celebrate if one of the two materials is lacking. If, after the consecration, it is discovered that either the bread or the wine is defective, fresh material must be brought and consecrated to perfect the sacrifice.

Another conclusion from this doctrine is that, very probably,

---

lated by Christ, and which gives this sacramental act its meaning and its sacrificial value. This *"ordinatio"* is the *"forma metaphysica"* which makes of the physical sacrifice the act *par excellence* of divine worship (p. 425).

11. It is attributed to St. Alphonsus (cf. Noldin, (1909), n. 164), altho the illustrious Doctor does not commit himself, and merely says that this opinion is regarded as probable by Lacroix. Alone amongst the authors of note, Ballerini admits this probability, and the best moralists of today agree in declaring his opinion dangerous and devoid of serious foundation.

the consecration of one single material (bread or wine) would not suffice to satisfy the obligation contracted by the acceptance of an honorarium.[12] In such a case, therefore, the celebrant would be bound to say another Mass, or, in the case of a large number of Masses, to ask for a condonation from the Holy See, if there are grave justifying reasons.

Article II.—The Fruits of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

10. Let us say a word about the blessings which the Mass brings to men.[13] These blessings may be considered either in themselves, or in their distribution to individuals.

1. CONSIDERED IN THEMSELVES, the fruits of the Mass are impetration, propitiation, and satisfaction.[14]

a. *Inasmuch as it is impetratory,* the Eucharistic sacrifice obtains for men the grace of conversion, assistance in time of temptation, the means of doing good and increasing their merits, the special protection of Providence in all the necessities of life, and even temporal goods when their possession may be conducive to their welfare.

These blessings are due to the intervention of Christ in our behalf, applying to us, in the most efficacious manner, the merits of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Consequently, in every subject who manifests the required dispositions, this result is infallible, and is produced *ex opere operato,* that is, by the very fact of the offering of the sacrifice. Nevertheless, this fruit still depends in part on the merits and the dignity of the Church, whose intervention is, of it-

---

12. This is the common teaching, but those who consider the contrary opinion as truly probable, maintain that the consecration of only one species would suffice for the satisfaction of the obligation.

The consecration of only one matter, they say, is *certainly* a beginning of sacrifice, since it is enough to produce the sacrament, and since the consecration of the other matter is exacted by the Rubrics simply to *perfect* the sacrifice. There was a sacrifice, therefore, imperfect it is true, but real.

13. There is no need of reaffirming that the principal end of the Eucharistic sacrifice is to offer God the glory that is due Him by virtue of His sovereign dominion, even as the thanksgivings demanded by His many blessings and the merciful pardon of our sins. Here we are considering only the blessings which the Holy Mass procures for us.

14. Certain authors speak only of the impetratory and the propitiatory fruit; some go so far as to include in the *propitiatory* effect of the Mass, all the fruits of the sacrifice. (Billot, *de Euch.,* p. 585, note 2.)

Merit does not enter into this enumeration. Only the priest and his cooperators, by the concourse which they lend to the sacrifice, perform a good work, and therefore acquire merit *de condigno* or *de congruo,* according as they are or are not in the state of grace. But it is only in an improper sense that this merit can be counted amongst the fruits of the Mass.

self, infallible, as well as on the dispositions of the priest *(ex opere operantis)*.[15]

b. *Inasmuch as it is propitiatory,* the sacrifice of the Mass has for its effect the appeasing of the wrath of God, and, thru the removal of that obstacle, the disposing God to grant us the graces which will produce repentance in our souls and procure for us the remission of our sins.

It is in this sense that we are to understand the declaration of the Council of Trent that the Mass has the power of remitting sins, mortal and venial. It is not a question of direct or immediate remission. The effect of the sacrifice, both as regards venial sins and as regards mortal sins, is to dispose God in our favor, and to obtain for us the grace to make acts of contrition, which will earn for us the forgiveness of our sins.[16]

The Mass, moreover, wards off calamities, scourges, evils of all sorts, as well as the spiritual miseries which God would have justly inflicted on us, if the Eucharistic sacrifice had not appeased his anger.

This is likewise an infallible effect and *ex opere operato,* of the intervention of Christ. Nevertheless, the aids that God deigns to grant us in this fashion, to dispose us to receive the grace of justification, presuppose, for their effectiveness, certain dispositions of the soul, "a movement of our heart towards God, an act of faith and of at least imperfect contrition for our sins," as the Council of Trent puts it. In a word, God always gives his help, but because of the bad dispositions of him for whom the sacrifice is offered and who will not repent of his sins, this help cannot always have its effect.

c. *Inasmuch as it is satisfactory,* the Mass blots out, both for the living and for the dead, the temporal punishment which they must still endure after having received forgiveness for their sins. In this way it takes the place, for the living, of the penitential

15. This fruit of the Mass may be secured by all men, believers or infidels, but it is infallible only when the subject is in the state of grace and asks for a favor which is useful towards his eternal salvation and in harmony with the habitual order of Providence. Moreover, when we say that the impetratory fruit of the Mass is infallible, we do not pretend that God necessarily and immediately grants the special object of our petition; God may have reasons to delay his answer, or to give us some other favor which will be more useful to us.

16. The immediate effect of propitiation of the Mass is to excite the mercy of God, to appease His wrath and to make Him forgiving, so that He may give the grace and the gift of repentance. The remission of sins to well disposed souls is only a mediate effect, which should be secured immediately by other means, especially by the sacraments which were instituted for that purpose.

works by which they might have secured the remission of this temporal punishment.

It is a question here of direct and *ex opere operato* remission. By the Mass, the satisfaction of Christ Himself becomes, as it were, the property of the soul for whom the Mass is offered (provided that the soul is in the state of grace), and it blots out its debts in whole or in part, according to the good pleasure of God, and also in accordance with the more or less perfect dispositions of the soul itself.

It is the teaching of the Council of Trent that the Mass is offered "for the living and the dead, for the remission of sins, punishments, satisfactions, and for our various necessities." It declares also that the souls in Purgatory find their principal consolation in the fruits of the Eucharistic sacrifice, but it does not say that this sacrifice infallibly remits *all* their punishment.[17]

2. CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE PERSONS who receive them, the fruits of the Mass are variously classified.

The first portion *(the general fruit)* goes to all the members of the mystical body, living or dead, who are not unworthy. This is the will of the Church as clearly shown by liturgical texts; and the contrary will of the celebrant can in no wise change it.[18]

Nevertheless, those who assist at the Mass, and those who cooperate in it in any fashion whatsoever (sacred ministers, acolytes, Mass-servers, singers, sacristans, those who provide the honorarium or the matter for the sacrifice), are the most highly favored; and their participation in the fruits of the sacrifice is in proportion to their cooperation and to their dispositions. Most authors admit that this *special fruit* (which, however, many do not distinguish from the general fruit) is not only impetratory and propitiatory, but also satisfactory. The common opinion is that this fruit is personal and cannot be transferred.[19]

---

17. When he for whom the sacrifice is offered has no need of the satisfaction of Christ, or is unworthy of receiving it, God applies it at once to other souls; this is the most common opinion.

A man who is in the state of grace may receive the fruits of the Mass without knowing it, provided he does not positively reject the remission of his punishment. Even attachment to venial sin would not deprive him of this favor, at least in a general way, but he would still be subject to the punishment due to that sin, as the punishment cannot be forgiven if the sin itself is not forgiven.

18. This is what is called the *general* or universal fruit, a fruit of impetration and of propitiation, perhaps also of satisfaction, for the satisfactory fruit of the Mass, altho limited, can be so great that a portion of it will accrue to all the faithful.

19. However, the contrary opinion is still probable, and the faithful may believe that in "hearing Mass" for somebody's intention, they yield to that person not only

More abundant still is the fruit which accrues to the celebrant, provided he is in the state of grace. This is called the *personal* or *very special* fruit. It is at one and the same time impetratory, propitiatory, and satisfactory, and is infallibly obtained providing that the required conditions are realized,[20] (v.g., the state of grace so far as the satisfactory fruit is concerned).

11. The Efficacy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—We have just enumerated the fruits of the sacrifice of the Mass, and we have seen how they are distributed in the mystical body of Christ. But in what measure does the Mass produce these different effects? Is its value finite or infinite, and does its efficacy vary according to the number of those who share it?

Considering the Mass in itself, that is, taking into account only the nature and the intrinsic dignity of the sacrifice, it must be conceded that it is of infinite value, since the victim is of infinite worth and the principal priest of infinite dignity. Nevertheless, it can produce in men only limited effects, for creatures are not capable of receiving infinite effects and exhausting all the power of an infinite cause. It is certain that the effects of the Holy Sacrifice are generally in proportion to the dispositions of those who receive them. On these different points, however, it can be said that not all authorities agree.

But it is not so with regard to the following question: Can the effects or the fruits of the sacrifice of the Mass remain limited, and yet increase indefinitely in proportion to the dispositions or the number of the persons to whom they are applied? If we consider only the dignity of the Mass, it is evident that it can produce fruits that are more and more perfect, and more and more abundant, no matter what may be the number of the beneficiaries; for it has the same value as the sacrifice of the Cross, and the power of a single drop of Christ's blood is infinite.

To clarify the matter, let us once more remark that it is not a

---

the fruit merited by the effort and the good will which they manifest, but also the special fruit which comes to them from the sacrifice *"ex opere operato."*

It may be held also that by assisting at several Masses at the same time one shares in the fruits of all of them; this opinion is not general, but it is the most probable opinion, for it is not impossible to give to several Masses the attention necessary to receive the fruits of the sacrifice.

20. Therefore, *the dispositions being equal,* he who has a Mass said will derive more fruit from the sacrifice than he who merely assists at it; this is the common opinion as regards the satisfactory fruit (especially for the dead), but many authors say that it is more easy for the living to obtain the impetratory fruit by assisting at Mass than by having a Mass said (Lehmkuhl, 254).

question of the fruit which accrues to those who in one manner or another *offer* the Holy Sacrifice together with the priest. From this viewpoint, the greater or larger number of assistants does not prevent each individual from deriving from the Mass just as many blessings as tho he were quite alone. *Each oblation* is a distinct source of grace, a means whereby each offerer may draw in proportion to his dispositions from the inexhaustible treasury of the merits and satisfactions of Christ.—The question concerns solely the fruit which flows from the application made by the priest to those for whom he celebrates the Mass (the *ministerial* or *special* fruit).

Some theologians[21] maintain that the ministerial fruit of the Holy Sacrifice is limitless both in intensity and in extension, that is to say, that the effects of each Mass, *of whatever kind* (impetratory, propitiatory, and satisfactory), can increase indefinitely, in accordance with the dispositions and also in accordance with the number of those to whom they are applied by the priest. When the priest says Mass for a hundred persons, each one of this hundred receives the remission of a quantity of temporal punishment corresponding to his dispositions, just as if the sacrifice were offered for him alone.[22] The number of those who, together with him, share in the effects of the sacrifice, cannot in any way diminish the fruit which accrues to him by reason of his dispositions.

Most authors hold the contrary opinion. They admit, indeed, that the *impetratory* fruit of the Mass is limitless in intensity and in extension, which means that no matter how large the number of those who are recommended to God by the priest, and no matter how great the number of the favors that are asked for them,

---

21. St. Alphonsus Liguori is wrongly classed among them; for, from 1769 he gave up this opinion and maintained the contrary opinion.
Moreover, almost all the authors whom the Holy Doctor quotes in favor of his first thesis are of a different opinion (cf. Cappello, n. 592, Notes 11 & 12).

22. However, amongst these authors, there are some who do not admit that a Mass which is applied to several persons is as profitable to each of them as tho it were said for him alone. For, they say, the intensity and the precision with which the human will is directed toward each of the objects which it embraces, are in inverse ratio to the number of the objects. The greater the number of the persons for whom the priest offers up the Holy Sacrifice, the more vague and the less intense will be his intention concerning each of them. Applied to ten or to a hundred persons, the Holy Mass will therefore be of less benefit to each of them than if it were said for him alone.
The principle is true, no doubt, but it seems to us that the intention of the priest may be as clear and as precise when it includes two persons as when it refers to only one. Why should there be an obligation *of justice* to say a Mass for each of those who have given a stipend, if the same sacrifice offered for a twofold intention would secure for the beneficiaries the same advantages as two Masses for special intentions?

the Eucharistic sacrifice will have for each of them the same sacrifice as though it were offered for him alone.[23] But when it is a question of the *satisfactory* fruit, they hold that it is limited and less abundant for each individual according as the number of those for whom the sacrifice is offered, increases. Each Mass has for its effect the application to men of a determined quantity of the satisfactions of Christ; and this sum is divided amongst all those for whom the Mass is offered, in accordance with the dispositions of each individual. Consequently, when the Mass is offered for several persons, it remits for each of them a quantity of temporal punishment less than if it had been said for him alone. God has thus willed, in His infinite wisdom, no doubt with the intention of inducing men to have frequent recourse to the Holy Sacrifice and to perform the acts of virtue necessary to profit by it.

Those who maintain this opinion say that it is logical to attribute to the Eucharistic sacrifice a mode of efficacy like to that of the sacraments. Like them, the Mass applies to us the infinite treasure of the merits of Christ; but the sacraments possess only an efficacy that is limited by the will of God, without which it would be of no avail, in spite of the contrary opinion, to reiterate them or to administer several of them, while the dispositions of the subject remained the same.—This doctrine is based particularly on the sentiment and the practice of the Church, the infallible interpreter of the will of Christ. For we know that it is a custom approved by the Church to celebrate Mass for one dead person in particular; she recommends also the offering of the Holy Sacrifice *several times* for the same intention; when she grants the favor of the privileged altar, she makes the condition that the plenary indulgence must be applied to the soul for whom the Mass is celebrated, which is again a means of fostering the practice of offering Masses for a particular intention. But if it were true that the fruits of the sacrifice could increase indefinitely, this practice would be useless or cruel, and the Church should, on the contrary, in the spirit of charity, urge or command priests always to apply the Mass to all the faithful, living and dead.

Moreover, the Church forbids her priests to satisfy by one single Mass two obligations resulting from the reception of stipends,

---

23. This, they say, is because the impetratory value of the Mass depends solely upon the intrinsic and infinite dignity of the sacrifice, without any restriction imposed by the will of God; it is, therefore, of greater worth than the object of our petitions, no matter what it may be.

and she declares that to act in this manner would be to *sin against justice*. But wherein would this practice violate justice if one single Mass obtained for all the faithful specified by the priest as much grace as for one?

This doctrine shows very clearly the conviction of the Church that the Mass produces effects that are limited and divisible among those for whom it is offered, and that, even when offered for one particular soul, it does not infallibly obtain all the graces that would be of benefit to it. The Council of Trent does indeed declare that the souls in Purgatory are *comforted* by the Holy Mass, but it does not say that they are necessarily delivered by it from all punishment.

The Eucharistic sacrifice, therefore, applies to us the infinite merits of the Sacrifice of the Cross, but in a limited manner, either because of the dispositions of him who receives them, or because such is the will of Christ, a will which is made known to us thru the recommendations or commands of the Church. We may sum up this doctrine in one sentence: if the dispositions are the same, the fruits received by the beneficiaries of the Mass are proportioned to their number and to the application made to them by the priest; if the application is the same in every case, then the fruit varies in accordance with the dispositions of the individual.

12. Secondary Intentions.—It is plain, according to this doctrine, what we are to hold concerning the secondary intentions[24] of the celebrant. He can apply to others than the ones for whom he celebrates Mass, the *impetratory* fruit of the Mass; that is to say, he can ask from God, thru the intercession of the Eucharistic victim, the graces which they need. And this intention can be absolute, since the impetratory fruit is infinite in extension.

As regards the *satisfactory* fruit, he can make a secondary application of this only conditionally, that is, on condition that it does not in any way interfere with the primary intention, and that it is subordinated to the will of him for whom the Mass is celebrated and who can reserve unto himself or others the fruit not received by the subject of the primary intention.[25]

---

24. By this is meant the conditional application of the Sacrifice to a purpose or a person different from the one for whom justice or obedience compels the priest to say Mass. If we admit that the value of the sacrifice is of unlimited extension, these secondary intentions would have as much efficacy as the primary intention.

25. However, provided that the rights of those for whom there is an obligation to say Mass are safeguarded, it is not only permitted, but recommended, to apply, by

It is true that the opinion according to which the Eucharistic sacrifice has a value that is infinite in extension, that is, capable of conferring upon an indefinite number of persons as much fruit as upon one, still enjoys some degree of probability. Nevertheless, we must not forget that a priest cannot, by means of one single Mass, satisfy several obligations resulting from the acceptance of stipends; in other words, he is forbidden to accept several stipends for one single Mass. Alexander VII condemned the contrary opinion.

Moreover, the *Codex* forbids "the receiving of a stipend for a Mass which is already due by reason of another title" (Can. 825, No. 2). It is not allowed, therefore, to accept a stipend for a Mass which one is obliged to celebrate either because one has charge of souls (the Mass *pro populo*) or because one is the titular of a benefice, or because of a quasi-contract, a command imposed by a superior, or merely because of a promise which was made with the intention of binding oneself to say the Mass. This doctrine shows very clearly that it would be seriously temerarious to give to a secondary intention the same value as to the principal intention (cf. n. 26, No. 4).

CHAPTER II

The Priest and the Eucharistic Sacrifice

13. The Council of Trent, making a comparison between the sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice of the Cross, declares that both of them have the same principal priest, Our Lord Jesus Christ. For it is He, Who, after having been offered in a bloody manner on Calvary, presents Himself anew before His Father on the altar, in the external state of an immolated victim, to offer up a true tho unbloody sacrifice, commemorative and representative of the sacrifice of the Cross, and thus to apply to men the merits of His bloody sacrifice. The transubstantiation, it is true, must be attributed to God alone as the efficient cause, but God operates it only on the manifestation of the human will of Christ the Priest; and in this way the humanity of Christ is the principal instrumental cause of the consecration. Again it is Christ who,

---

means of a secondary intention, the fruits of the sacrifice to all the faithful, living and dead, and more particularly to those towards whom the priest has special obligations.

at the altar as on the Cross, *offers the victim* (Himself) to His Father, by a free act of His will.[26]

Nevertheless Christ, being invisible, had need of a visible representative on earth. This representative is the priest who, made by lawful ordination a partaker in the priesthood of Christ, is the separate and secondary instrument of the sacrifice and of the oblation of the Holy Victim.

The role of the priest in the Mass is to consecrate, and to apply the fruits of the sacrifice.

Article I.—The Power to Consecrate.

14. It is *de fide* that "only priests can consecrate the Holy Eucharist" (c. 802). For to them only did Our Lord say: "Do this in commemoration of Me." This power was conferred on them by the bishop on the day of ordination: "Receive, in the name of the Lord," he said, "the power to offer to God the Holy Sacrifice and to celebrate Mass for the living and the dead." By these words the priest becomes the secondary minister of the Sacrifice, and the vicar of Christ; he takes the place of Christ, even as an ambassador takes the place of him who sends him; he acts in the name of Christ, and likewise in the name of the Church, who has admitted him into the ranks of the hierarchy, and whom he represents at the altar.[27] He is, then, officially a public personage. But this does not in any way prevent him from praying or offering sacrifice for himself.

This power is inherent to the priestly character, and is therefore perpetual and indelible. Nothing can deprive a validly ordained priest of it, neither excommunication, nor suspension, nor even degradation.

---

26. The reason for this is that a new immolation requires an offering which can be accomplished only by him who makes the immolation.

If we admit the opinion which excludes a new immolation from the sacrifice of the Mass, it becomes less clear how Our Lord is the principal priest of the Mass. For in this case all the newness of the offering is on the side of the Church; *the priest acts alone,* altho he acts by virtue of the power which he has received from Christ. Christ does not renew His offering, but He permits the priest to make it his own, and to present to God his body and blood as our host. It follows from this that, without Christ, the offering of the priest would have no efficacy; but that is not sufficient, it seems to us, to justify us in saying that at the altar Christ truly exercises the office of principal priest.

27. Consequently, taking into consideration only the nature of the sacrifice, and not the accessory ceremonies, there can be no question of a *private* Mass. The Mass is always a sacrifice offered by a public minister in the interests of the community.

15. The doctrine stated above enables us to determine the value of a Mass offered by a more or less fervent priest, or by a priest who is in the state of sin.

Since the celebrant is at one and the same time the ambassador of Christ and the ambassador of the Church, and since the Mass is in the first place the offering of Christ and of the Church, it is always favorably received by Almighty God. The *essential* fruit, which is the result of the sacrifice itself and of the prayer of the Church, does not depend on the dispositions of the secondary minister. As regards the liturgical prayers which the priest recites during the Mass in the name of the Church, they always have their own value, no matter what may be the condition of soul of the celebrant. It is evident, however, that the attentiveness and fervor of the priest increase in a measure the complacence which God takes in these prayers, and, as a consequence, the graces which He grants in response to them.[28]

16. Some authors have wondered whether the priests who are separated from the Church or rejected by her (apostates, manifest heretics, schismatics, degraded, or excommunicated *vitandi,* and perhaps also those who are under a declaratory sentence of excommunication, suspension, or personal interdict) can *validly* offer the sacrifice of the Mass. To deny them this power would be almost a heresy, for the power to consecrate is a power of order which does not postulate the power of jurisdiction, and which nothing can destroy or suppress. The Church cannot prevent a priest from speaking or acting in the name of Christ; and, *quoad substantiam,* the Mass of a separated priest is a true sacrifice producing all *ex opere operato* the fruits of the sacrifice. Nevertheless the Church can forbid a priest to speak and act in her stead; she can suppress the commission which she had given him to offer up in her name the prayers and the ceremonies instituted by her. And consequently the Mass of a separated priest does not produce the fruits which result *ex opere operantis Ecclesiae,* nor those which result *ex opere operantis sacerdotis,* unless the celebrant is in good faith and is in the state of grace.

17. Sacrifice and Oblation.—These two terms are not synony-

28. Inasmuch as it is the work of Christ and of His Church, the Mass has always the same value, whatever may be the condition of soul of the celebrant; inasmuch as it is the personal work of the priest, its efficacy depends on his devotion like any other prayer of a private person. But the principal effect of the Mass can never be destroyed by the evil dispositions of the celebrant.

mous. Sacrifice always includes oblation; but not every oblation is a sacrifice. And while it is true that the faithful partake in the oblation, it is not true that they partake, strictly speaking, in the act of sacrifice.

To offer a sacrifice, one must first have received the power to do so, that is, the order of priesthood. Consequently, in the Mass, the priest is the only sacrificer. To him alone did Christ say: "Do this in commemoration of Me." He alone is delegated by the Church to *offer* in her name the sacrifice instituted by Christ. And it is because he is the authorized representative of the Church that the priest disposes of the application of the Mass.

Nevertheless the faithful truly participate in this offering, as is proven by numerous texts of the Fathers and the theologians of the Church, and still more clearly by the words of the liturgy which so often refer to the moral union of priest and people in the offering of the sacrifice.[29] It is enough to be a member of the Church to have a share in this oblation; but still more intimate and still more complete is the participation of those who assist at the Mass or who cooperate in some manner in the sacrifice, either by taking some steps to have it celebrated, or by giving an honorarium or establishing foundations of Masses, or by furnishing the matter for the sacrifice and the objects which are necessary for it, or by discharging the office of server of the Mass. This cooperation insures a more ample participation in the fruits of the sacrifice, although it remains always subordinated to the dispositions of the various cooperators.

18. Concelebration.—It is still the custom, in the Oriental Church, to have two priests offer up together the same sacrifice, or to have several priests unite with the bishop and consecrate together with him. The Holy See, far from condemning this custom, demands that it shall be retained.

In the Latin Church, there are only two cases in which con-

---

29. Very often the priest speaks in the name of all the faithful: *offerimus tibi, Domine, calicem salutaris . . . ; Orate fratres, ut meum et vestrum sacrificium . . .* St. Peter said to the early Christians: "You are a holy people, a royal priesthood" . . . It is a question, not of the ministerial priesthood, but of that mystical priesthood which consists in offering internally to God His only Son, and in uniting with the offering of the High Priest Christ; of that priesthood which gives to all the members of the mystic body of Christ a share in the sacrifice offered in the name of all by the ministerial priesthood, which permits all Christians, "united with all the priests in the world, to offer up Jesus Our Host, immolated on one altar after another at every hour thruout the whole world, and to celebrate with them a perpetual Mass, following the Lamb whithersoever He goes, wheresoever He is immolated."

celebration is permitted; the Mass of the ordination of priests, and the Mass of the consecration of a bishop[30] *(Can. 803)*.

There is, in this mode of celebration, a serious difficulty, which has been the subject of profound study and of varying solutions by different authors: How do the formulas pronounced by different persons produce the consecration of the same matter?

According to Benedict XIV (*De Sacrif. Missae, l III, c.* 16, *n. 7*) these multiple formulas constitute, *by their moral union,* one identical cause of transubstantiation. This might be true, of course, provided that they were all uttered at precisely the same instant; but it would be very difficult for numerous celebrants to pronounce at precisely the same instant the words of consecration. But the sacramental words produce immediately that which they signify; and as it is not in the power of the priest to suspend their effect, the matter is consecrated as soon as one of these formulas is completed. In practice, young priests should, following the recommendations of the Pontifical, strive to pronounce the words of consecration at the same time as the bishop; they need not, however, formulate an intention different from that which they would have if they were celebrating alone.[31] Whatever may be their role in the immolation of the Victim, all those who celebrate together *offer* that Victim to God in the name of Christ and of His Church, and in this manner exercise the priestly power which has just been conferred upon them.

Article II.—The Power of Applying the Fruits of the Mass

19. By the application of the Mass we mean the intention by which the celebrant decides that the *ministerial* fruit (which some style the *special* fruit) shall accrue to a certain person or to a certain specified purpose.

This power of applying the fruits of the Mass is inherent to

30. At the ordination Mass, the new priests and the Bishop consecrate the same host and the same chalice; at the Mass of consecration, the two Bishops consecrate at one and the same time two hosts and one chalice.

31. Certain authors require of the new priests the intention of consecrating only when all shall have finished saying the words of consecration, or the intention of not consecrating if they utter the words before the Bishop. The Church has never recommended these kinds of intentions.

The ministers of the concelebration, however numerous, all have the power to *offer* to God the Eucharistic Victim in the name of the Church; *a special fruit corresponds to each oblation.* And for this reason each celebrant may accept a stipend.

the sacerdotal character.[32] The application made by the priest is, therefore, always valid, and no one on earth has the power to prevent its efficacy; but it would be illicit if it were in opposition to the will of the Church.

No. 1. How the Application of the Mass is Made.

20. Three conditions are required in order that this application may be *valid:*

1. The intention of the celebrant must be *at least habitual;* he must have willed this application, and he must not have retracted his determination. For a donation is valid as soon as it has been made, and as long as it has not been revoked.

It is not necessary, therefore, that the priest, in saying Mass, should formulate an actual intention, nor that he should have thought of it while preparing to celebrate. It is evident that that would be a useful and praiseworthy practice; but what is essential is that the intention, even if it dates back several months, has not been revoked by a contrary intention.[33]

2. This intention must specify, at least implicitly, the person or the purpose to which the priest wishes to apply the fruits of the Mass.[34]

It would not be enough, therefore, to celebrate "for one of the ten[35] different persons who have given stipends." But it is per-

---

32. This is plain from the words of ordination: *Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis."*
Therefore did Pius VI condemn the doctrine of the pseudo-Council of Pistoia, which denied the priest the power to apply the ministerial fruit of the Mass.

33. The interpretative intention (the intention one would have if one thought of it) is not sufficient.
It is quite certain also that an actual intention destroys a contrary habitual intention, unless indeed the priest, in formulating the first intention, had the formal will to make it prevail, in case of doubt, over any later intention. When, after Mass, there still remains any doubt concerning the priority of intentions, he has only to apply another Mass to that one of the two intentions which has not yet been satisfied.

34. The priest may certainly apply the different fruits of the Mass to different intentions; for example, he may apply the satisfactory fruit to a soul in Purgatory, the impetratory fruit to a sick person. If he celebrates gratuitously, he makes this division as he pleases. When he has promised a Mass, or is bound thru obedience to say Mass for a prescribed purpose, he may still dispose of the fruits which are not included in the promise or in the prescribed purpose. If, for instance, he has promised a Mass of thanksgiving, he may dispose of the satisfactory fruit for another intention.
On the other hand, when he has received a stipend for saying the Mass, this division of the fruits of the sacrifice (altho always valid) is not licit, unless with the formal permission of the giver of the stipend.

35. Each of the abovementioned ten Masses may be celebrated for the ten givers of stipends at the same time; each of them will then receive one tenth of the fruits

mitted to celebrate "for the first one of the ten persons who have given stipends," "for the intention which is marked down for today in my Register of Masses," "for the most abandoned soul," "for the most sorely tempted soul," etc. What is required, and what suffices is that the person for whom the Mass is offered shall be determined clearly enough to be known to God.

However, it is forbidden to apply the Mass to the intention of "the first person who shall, in the future, offer a Mass-stipend." And when that future stipend has been offered, it is forbidden to pocket it under the pretext that the Mass has already been celebrated (c. 825, No. 1). In certain cases of this kind, the determination of the person and of his intentions might be sufficiently precise to make the application of the Mass valid; but the Church, for good reasons, has prohibited this mode of procedure.[36]

3. This intention must be formulated before the consecration. For the sacrifice produces its effects *ex opere operato,* and as soon as it is completed, that is to say, at the moment of the consecration of the wine. The priest has no power to suspend the efficacy of the sacrifice and to delay its application.

The application, therefore, would be valid if it were made between the two consecrations. It is hardly necessary to add, with all the other writers on this subject, that the priest should take care to formulate his intention before commencing Mass, during his preparation.[37]

---

of each Mass. It is permitted to make use of this kind of intention when, a sum has been given by various persons for a certain number of Masses, and it is impossible to know the exact stipend given for each Mass. But if the stipend is clearly determined, it is better to say for each giver of stipends the number of Masses to which he has a right.

When a priest celebrates Masses for stipends given by strangers, it is sufficient to say *"ad intentionem dantis," "ad intentionem distributoris"* as many Masses as there are stipends, regulating this intention by the order in which the stipends were given. The same holds true when the stipend is composed of small sums deposited by various persons in a box; each contributor receives in proportion to the amount contributed.

36. Vague formulas must be avoided, such as *"ad mentem Dei", "ad mentem B.V.M."*—the application would be null and void if, by these words, the priest intended to leave it to the good pleasure of God or of the Blessed Virgin; it is the priest who must apply the fruits of the Mass, therefore his intention should at the very least mean: "I celebrate for him in favor of whom God desires that I should say this Mass."

37. A conditional application is ordinarily valid; but the condition must be such that it does not prevent the intention from being verified at the moment of consecration, like the following: "I celebrate Mass for N..., on condition that before a month passes by he shall obtain a certain favor for me." For the priest cannot leave thus suspended the fruit of the sacrifice. This condition will be licit or illicit according as it is compatible or incompatible with the dignity of the sacrifice.

Very often, moreover, instead of a true condition, it is a question, in the intention of the priest, of only an accidental circumstance whose non-realization does not rob

21. What becomes of the *ministerial* fruit of the sacrifice if the priest has failed to make the application of it or if he applies it to a soul which is incapable of receiving it?

According to certain authors, this fruit remains in the treasury of the Church. According to others, it accrues to the priest himself, or to the most abandoned souls, or again (in the second hypothesis) to the relatives of the person who has given the stipend.

The application depends on the will of the priest. If he has formulated no intention, the ministerial fruit certainly remains in the treasury of the Church. If he has formulated an intention, at least general, habitual, and implicit, that the fruit should return to him, or to a specified category of persons, his will will be followed, since he is the dispenser of the riches of the Mass. He must not forget, however, in the hypothesis that the person for whom the sacrifice is offered is incapable of receiving its fruits, that the giver of the stipend may have the intention of helping other persons, and the priest should make his own intention conform to this.

In practice, therefore, there is real utility for the priest in forming once for all, and in never revoking this determination, the intention of reserving to himself or to other specified souls (if this can be done without prejudice to anyone else), the ministerial fruit which, for any reason, would not be applied.

No. 2. To Whom May the Fruits of the Sacrifice be Applied?

22. As a general rule, "the Mass may be applied[38] to all men, whether they be living, or whether they be dead and are expiating their sins in Purgatory" (c. 809). "As regards an excommunicated person, it is not forbidden to celebrate private Masses

---

his intention of its efficacy. For instance: a priest learns that a friend is sick, and offers Mass for his intention; but it develops that the news of his sickness was false; the application is nevertheless valid.

Can the same be said if a priest says Mass for someone whom he wrongfully thinks to be dead, and from whom he had received a stipend for a Mass to be said *after his death?* If, in the mind of the giver of the stipend, death was an absolute condition, the priest would not have fulfilled the conditions of the contract; but, unless there is proof to the contrary, he may presume that the element of death was only an accidental circumstance.

38. It is a question of the application of the *ministerial* fruit of the Mass, insofar as it is the particular work of Christ and the Church, represented by the priest.

for him, provided that all scandal be avoided; if he is *vitandus,* Mass can be said only for his conversion" (c. 2262, No. 2, n. 2).

Therefore, with the exception of the inhabitants of heaven, the damned, and those who are in Limbo, all men, living or dead, can derive some fruit from the Sacrifice of the Mass.

23. From this principle flow the following conclusions:

1. It is not allowed, strictly speaking, to say Mass *for* the saints, nor for baptized children who have died before reaching the age of reason.[39] At the very most we are permitted to offer Mass to ask that the cultus of the saints be fostered here on earth; and it is already a sign of honor for them when we give thanks to God for the gifts that He so generously gave them.

Likewise when we say Mass for baptized children who have died before the age of reason, it is to honor God, to thank Him for the favor He has given them, and to ask Him, by their intercession, for the graces we need.[40]

But there is nothing to prevent the celebration of Mass for those who have died in the odor of sanctity, or even for those who have endured martyrdom, so long as the Holy See has not yet solemnly proclaimed their entry into heaven.[41]

2. It is not allowed to say Mass for the damned, nor for those who are in Limbo. For both these classes the Mass can be of no utility. The opinion of certain authors who thought that the Mass could mitigate the torments of hell, or bring some measure of consolation to the damned, has no foundation.

But there is nothing to justify the application of this rule to those whom death has surprised in sin *(in actu aut in statu peccati),* even if they were public sinners and even if they died without giving any sign of repentance. We do not know the secrets of God's justice and mercy. And there is no law which forbids the priest to make *private*[42] application of the fruits of the Mass to

---

39. The sacrifice is always offered to God alone; when a priest says the Mass of the Blessed Virgin or of some saint, this expression means that he adores God in memory and in the name of the saint, and thanks Him for the gifts and the glory that He has bestowed on him, and prays to Him through the intercession of the saint. "The honor paid to the saints is not so much theirs as God's."

40. This Mass should be the Mass of the day, or the Mass of the Angels if the rubrics permit, or even a Mass of Requiem, but offered for all the faithful departed.

41. It would seem to be more in harmony with the mind of the Church to refrain from saying Mass for those whom she has declared "Blessed."

42. By *private* application we mean that which is not known to the public, which is not announced to the congregation or revealed by the external pomp of a ceremony. In the Mass itself, the one for whom the Mass is said, is not to be named.

In a different sense, we often use the term *"private Mass"* to mean one which does

these unfortunates, even if their sin was public and manifest.[43]

What the Church does forbid in cases of this kind (c. 1240), is giving them ecclesiastical burial and celebrating Mass *publicly* for their intention. Ecclesiastical burial and the public celebration of the Mass are correlative things; one entails the other, although the public celebration of Mass does not necessarily call for all the external solemnities of the funeral services.

3. The sacrifice of the Mass may be offered up for the intention of *living* heretics, schismatics, and infidels, either for the purpose of imploring their conversion, or for the purpose of obtaining for them the spiritual and temporal helps that may be useful for them. The priest may, in such a case, accept a stipend.

Even after their death, and even though they have given no signs of repentance or conversion, it is permitted to celebrate for their intention.[44] Nevertheless, when people offer a priest a stipend for a Mass of this kind, he should state very plainly that the Mass can be of service to the souls of these dead persons only if they died in the state of grace, and if God deigns to permit the fruits of the sacrifice to be applied to them.

In both cases all danger of scandal on the part of the faithful must be avoided, as also all danger of error or superstition on the part of unbelievers. Moreover, note well that the Church authorizes only the *private* celebration of the Mass, without solemnity and without publication.[45]

This doctrine is more liberal, in certain respects, than that of the theologians of former times. It follows from the general rule enunciated above; and there is, moreover, no particular prohibition of the Church which would condemn this mode of action.

---

not enjoy any privilege, and which is neither parochial nor conventual, but is said through the devotion of a family or of an individual. Nothing prevents such a Mass from being sung.

43. In order that a sinner may be called *"public and manifest,"* he must have committed *at least* one grevious sin, which is known to the community; and he must have failed to evince any sign of repentence.

44. In this case it would be better to refrain from saying a Requiem Mass, or at least the special oration for the dead.

If a heretic or a schismatic, before dying, had shown signs of repentance and abjured his errors, he would have a right to ecclesiastical burial (c.1240, No. 1, 1); therefore it would not be forbidden to say Mass publicly for him.

45. However, when it is a question of a ruler who is a heretic or even an infidel, it is not forbidden to hold solemn services for him to obtain for him all the graces necessary for the good government of the country. But after his death it is not allowed, without the authorization of the Holy See, to offer the Holy Sacrifice *publicly* for him, unless he showed at least some signs of conversion to the Catholic faith or of repentance. Sometimes the Holy See gives such a permission provided that opportune statements are given out to prevent the faithful from being scandalized.

4. It is permitted to say Mass—but only *privately* and without danger of scandal—for an excommunicated person,[46] living or dead, even though he was the subject of a public sentence, and even though he gave no sign of repentance at his death.

In case he repented, or, in any hypothesis, if no *public* sentence of excommunication had been pronounced against him, he would have a right to ecclesiastical burial (c. 1240, No. 1, n. 2); and therefore it would be permitted to celebrate Mass *publicly* for him.

No. 3. The Mode of Applying the Fruits of the Sacrifice to the Souls in Purgatory.

24. It is *de fide* that the Sacrifice of the Mass can and should be applied[47] to the dead, and is profitable unto them (Council of Trent, XXII, ch. 2). It is likewise a theologically certain doctrine that the application of the fruits of the sacrifice is made to them, at least in general, not only *ex opere operantis,* but also *ex opere operato* and in an infallible manner, by virtue of the words of Jesus Christ: "This is My Blood . . . which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins."[48]

The souls of the baptized faithful, which are detained in Purgatory, receive all the fruits of the Mass; they are already pro-

---

46. When it is a question of an *excommunicatus tolcratus,* it is allowed to say Mass for all the customary intentions; if he is an *excommunicatus vitandus,* the Holy Sacrifice may be offered for him only for the purpose of obtaining his conversion (c.2262, No. 2, 2).

47. Even without any special application, the Mass is of benefit to all the souls in Purgatory since the priest always offers up the Immaculate Host "for all the faithful, living and dead."

48. It is certainly better not to wait until death to have Masses said for them. Besides the merit which there is in paying out the money for stipends, besides the certainty of not being deprived of the fruits of the sacrifice, we must not forget that the Mass obtains for the living more numerous and more abundant fruits than for the dead. Together with the forgiveness of their temporal punishment, it obtains for them spiritual and temporal graces which will help them to lead a more Christian life, to die well, and to increase their eternal glory.

"The fruits of the Sacrifice of the Mass," said Benedict XV in a letter to the Superior of the Fathers of Tinchebray, "are of greater efficacy during life than after death; for their application to good-intentioned and well-disposed living men is more direct, more certain, and more abundant; as a consequence, the Mass, besides having the power to give us the grace of final perseverance, has also the power to offer us in this life an efficacious means of appeasing the justice of God and of acquitting in full or at least considerably shortening the expiation of the pains of Purgatory. . . . Too many Christians are not aware of the fact that this sacrifice can be of *the greatest benefit to them,* if, while they are alive, they have it offered up for themselves, instead of entrusting to their heirs, their neighbors, or their friends, the duty of having it offered for the relief of their souls after their death. . . . For by its graces they might be enabled to avoid many sins, and at the same time to secure forgiveness for sins already committed; and they might be efficaciously assisted to gain more abundant merit."

gressing towards heaven *(in statu viae),* and realize all the conditions demanded by God and by the Church.

As to the souls of those who were not baptized, but who died in the state of grace, most theologians say that the Mass cannot be of assistance to them, since it belongs particularly to the members of the visible Church. And yet those souls certainly belong to the Church Suffering, they are members of the mystical body of Christ; and since, in Purgatory, there is no distinction between the soul and the body of the Church, it is impossible to see why the satisfactory fruit of the sacrifice should not be applied to them. In any case, the Mass certainly obtains for them, in an indirect manner, through the good works and prayers of the faithful, a mitigation of their sufferings and as a consequence the more speedy possession of the happiness of heaven.

25. The application of the *satisfactory* fruit to the souls of the dead (at least of those who were baptized) is *immediate,* in this sense that the satisfaction resulting from the sacrifice and determined by Christ becomes theirs at once, on condition, however, that there is in these souls no obstacle to the application of this fruit. For God could, taking into consideration the sins and negligences of a soul, decide that the satisfactions offered for that soul should not bring it comfort until the divine wrath has been appeased. To be sure, the Mass, more than any other good work, tends to produce that effect, but we do not know the exact measure of its power of propitiation, and we do not know how many satisfactory works, suffrages, and sacrifices are required to put a soul in the state where it can receive the satisfactions of Christ and be delivered from Purgatory.[49]

Nor do we know in what proportion this application is made. It may remit all the punishment of a soul, or only a part of it, according as God in his wisdom and justice has decreed, and according to the dispositions of the soul during its time on earth. It is not, therefore, merely the number of Masses celebrated for a soul that determines its entry into heaven; a poor man for whom

---

49. It is for this same reason that the indulgence of the privileged altar, which, of itself, has power enough to secure the immediate deliverance of a soul from Purgatory, produces its effects only in the measure determined by the mercy and the justice of God (Cong. of Indulgences, July 28, 1840). Because of certain sins or negligences, the soul may be, as it were, surrounded by thick darkness which prevents it from receiving the rays of light and heat which radiate from the Holy Sacrifice; and it is only by the offering of many Masses and repeated prayers that this darkness can finally be dispelled (Lehmkuhl, 248).

no one in particular offers prayers may have less punishment to expiate; and, because he has led a more holy life, he may be delivered from Purgatory sooner than the rich man for whom many Masses are celebrated. In like manner, altho in itself the offering of a Mass for a dead person is more useful than the simple assisting at Mass for his intention, yet, by reason of his dispositions, God may attach to the prayers of his friends as much efficacy as to the celebration of several Masses for another and less well disposed soul.

CHAPTER III

Concerning the Obligation of Celebrating Mass

26. There can be, for the priest, various reasons which impose on him the obligation of celebrating Mass. The principal ones are the priestly order itself, the acceptance of an office to which the care of souls is attached, and the acceptance of a stipend.

However, before proceeding to the consideration of each of these in detail, it may not be useless to recall to mind certain other reasons which may bind a priest to offer up the Holy Sacrifice.

1. A priest who receives a simple benefice (without the care of souls and without residence) is bound to celebrate Mass, and is also, unless there is an explicit concession to the contrary, bound to apply it according to the intentions of the founder. This is an obligation of justice.[50]

2. All Chapters, of whatever nature they may be, are bound, unless excused by an apostolic indult, to apply the conventual Mass to their benefactors in general (c. 417). Neither custom nor the Bishop can dispense from this obligation. But the celebrant may accept a stipend taken from the funds or from the revenues of the prebends.[51]

3. The Sovereign Pontiff can impose on *all* priests the celebra-

---

50. He is bound also to observe the various circumstances of time, place and quality of the Mass. However, he is permitted to sometimes refrain from celebrating out of respect or from a spirit of humility; if he is sick, or hindered by a grave reason, he may dispense himself from saying Mass for two weeks or a month; for a longer period, he must secure a substitute for the celebration of Mass, except in case of extreme poverty or permission from the Holy See.

51. This Mass must be sung, except on days when the Bishop says pontifical Mass, or when another priest celebrates in place of the Bishop, when the latter is prevented from officiating.

tion and the application of the Holy Mass.[52]—The Bishop has the same power over the diocesan clergy of his diocese; but all authors agree that he should very seldom and only after prudent reflection issue orders concerning the *application* of the Mass.

The Superiors of regulars have the right to command their subjects, even under obedience (S.C.Rel., May 3, 1914), to celebrate according to their intention (if the rule does not forbid this), or according to intentions determined by the rule. Religious are bound in justice to celebrate Masses for which their Institute has accepted a stipend.[53]

4. Finally, the priest is obliged to celebrate and to apply the Holy Mass if he has made a promise to do so with the intention of binding himself to do so, or if he has made a vow to do so. The obligation is grave or light according to the nature of the promise or the vow. In case of doubt, one may presume that he did not intend to assume a grave obligation, or even that he promised only a secondary intention in the Holy Sacrifice, as a mark of benevolence. If, on the contrary, there was an unmistakable promise to *celebrate a Mass,* in the ordinary meaning of the term, the priest would not satisfy his obligations[54] by means of a secondary intention. So also, if he had promised several persons the application of a separate Mass in each case, he would not keep his promise by saying one single Mass for all these intentions together, unless he had promised to each person only one of the various fruits of the sacrifice, promising one person the impetratory fruit, another the satisfactory fruit, etc.

When the promise takes the form of a bilateral contract, the priest is bound in justice to fulfill it. Such, for instance, is the case of priests who belong to a pious association whose statutes

---

52. This doctrine is rejected by certain authors because, as they say, internal acts (like the application of the Mass) cannot be the object of a prescription even of ecclesiastical authority. But this opinion is far from certain, and moreover, it is a question here not of an act which is purely internal, but of a mixed act including at one and the same time the celebration and the application of the Mass.

In practice, in order not to deprive the priest of income which is oftentimes necessary, the Superiors ordinarily prescribe only the celebration of the Mass, and leave its application free (Lehmkuhl, 282).

53. When the Superior assigns an unremunerated intention to one of his religious, the latter is bound to celebrate by holy obedience, and the obligation is more or less rigorous according to the nature of the command given, and the customs of the Institute.

54. Ordinarily this promise binds only *sub levi,* unless there was a contrary intent in giving it. But it would be a mortal sin to fail to fulfill a promise made to a confrere to say Mass in his stead, if he was obliged *sub gravi,* v.g., because of a stipend which he had accepted.

prescribe the application of one or more Masses for the living or dead members of the association. It may be held, however, that unless there is an explicit clause to the contrary in the statutes, or unless the formal intention of the priest has been made to the contrary, this promise does not bind under pain of mortal sin.

Article I.—The Obligation Resulting from Priesthood

27. When Our Lord said to His apostles: "Do this in commemoration of Me," He formulated a real command; He wished to assure the perpetuity of the Eucharistic sacrifice. It is therefore *de fide* that for the priestly order taken in its entirety, there is an obligation of sometimes celebrating the Holy Mass.

28. Moreover, it is now certain that *"all priests* are obliged to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice several times each year" (c. 805).

The *Codex,* therefore, confirms the opinion that was heretofore commonly held in accordance with the teaching of St. Thomas and of St. Alphonsus. It must be admitted, with the same authors, that it is question here of a *grave* obligation, resulting less from the scandal which a contrary attitude would cause, than from the disorder which would arise from a priest's neglecting to employ according to the designs of God the power which God had given him; for the priest who would never celebrate the Holy Mass would possess a useless priesthood, and would be derelict as regards the mission he had received from the Church to continue the work of Christ.

A priest would comply with this law by celebrating *three or four times a year,* according to the common opinion; and he is not obliged to select holydays for this, or to place any interval[55] between the Masses. What the Church demands is that the fruits of the sacrifice shall be obtained; and the circumstance of time has no bearing on this result.

29. Moreover, the *Codex* bids Bishops and Superiors of religious to see "that their priests celebrate *at least* on all Sundays and all holydays of obligation" (c. 805). This is a proof of the de-

55. Certain authors have maintained that it would be a mortal sin for a priest not to say Mass for a space of six or eight months, or not to celebrate on Sundays and holydays of obligation. This opinion is extreme; the Council of Trent, it is true (Sess., 23, ch. 14), made it the duty of bishops to see that their priests said Mass on days of precept, but it did not state that there was any grave obligation for priests to do so.

sire of the Church that priests should celebrate as often as possible; and theologians commonly admit that it would be a venial sin for a priest to abstain without a just reason from saying Mass for a considerable length of time, for example, for five or six months. For it is the duty of the priest not to deprive God of the glory which this sacrifice affords Him, and the Church of the precious graces which she has the right to expect from her ministers[56] (Lehmkuhl, 260).

And if the welfare of souls demand it, the Bishop, in order to make it possible for the faithful to assist at Mass, may oblige *all his priests* to celebrate on all Sundays and all holydays of obligation (c. 128).

Article II.—The Obligation Resulting from an Office to which is Attached the Care of Souls

30. It is the teaching of the Church that all those who have the care of souls must offer the Holy Sacrifice for their people, that is, *celebrate* Mass and *apply* it to the souls that are entrusted to them (Council of Trent, XXIII, ch. 1). This is the will of Our Lord Himself; and moreover, the natural law tells us very plainly that between the pastor and his flock there is a quasi-contract which obliges the priest to procure for souls the graces which they need.

It is the Church, however, that has determined the circumstances of the application of the Mass *pro populo,*[57] the subjects of the law, the time, the place of celebration, etc. This precept is, therefore, at one and the same time, of divine and of ecclesiastical law.

31. The Subjects of the Law.—The Sovereign Pontiff is obliged, *de jure divino,* to say Mass sometimes for all the faithful.

---

56. On the contrary, to refrain from time to time from saying Mass, out of humility, for the purpose of avoiding the spirit of routine, or for the purpose of preparing better for saying Mass, cannot be anything but praiseworthy, and many saints have acted thus. However, Suarez says on this point that we should not imitate all the examples that the saints have given us.

It may be said that, dispositions being equal, there are more reasons for a priest to celebrate Holy Mass than for a lay person to receive Communion, both because of the obligations of his office and because of the blessings conferred by the Holy Sacrifice. This does not mean that the priest should not endeavor to bring to the celebration of Mass dispositions more perfect than the simple faithful are required to have for Communion.

57. By "people" in this connection, we mean solely the *living* faithful of the territory entrusted to the celebrant. The dead are no longer a part of his flock. It is, however, a pious practice to pray for them, reserving, of course, for the living all the fruits of the sacrifice which belong to them.

The ecclesiastical law affects:

1. All Bishops charged with the administration of a diocese (and hence also the suburban Cardinals), as soon as they have taken possession.

2. Abbots and Prelates *nullius.*

3. Vicars- and Prefects-Apostolic, with restrictions, however, as to the number of days.

4. Administrators-Apostolic sent to a diocese *titulo permanente* (c. 415).

5. Vicars capitular (c. 440).

6. Pastors,[58] as soon as they have taken possession of their parish (c. 466, No. 1), whatever the nature of their parish may be (territorial, familial, or personal).

7. Vicars perpetual (for example, the Vicar of a Chapter) who are charged with the administration of a parish annexed to a moral person (c. 471, No. 4).

8. *Vicarii economii,* appointed to administer a vacant parish, from the day on which they begin their duties (c. 473, No. 1).

9. Quasi-pastors in missionary countries, with the same restriction as for Vicars- and Prefects-Apostolic (c. 466, No. 1).

32. Neither titular Bishops,[59] Coadjutors, or Auxiliaries, nor Vicars General, nor the various vicars who may be associated with a pastor (even tho they may have all the rights and duties of a pastor), are bound to celebrate the Mass *pro populo.* For this is the personal obligation of the pastor.

The same holds good of chaplains of convents, prisons, and hospitals. They are not pastors, and the law does not apply to them.[60]

However, certain military chaplains may have a genuine parochial jurisdiction; and in such cases they are bound to the Mass *pro populo.* On this point they must be guided by the special pre-

---

58. While Bishops are obliged to say Mass *pro populo* by divine *absolute* law, because their institution is the act of Our Lord, pastors are bound to do so only by divine *hypothetical* law, that is, as a result of the ecclesiastical institution which makes them subject to the divine law (Lehmkuhl, 261).

59. Nevertheless, the *Codex* advises titular Bishops to sometimes say Mass, in a spirit of charity, for the diocese of which they have received the title (c.348, No. 2); this is merely a counsel, and to fulfill it, it is enough to say Mass for that intention on the principal feasts of the year.

60. This holds good when these chaplains exercise the functions of the pastoral ministry, administer the sacraments, preside at funerals. They are not pastors, in the true sense of the word, any more than the Superior of the Grand Seminary.

scriptions given by the Holy See for each individual nation (c. 451, No. 3).

As to the Superiors of religious, there is no precept of the Church which binds them to say Mass for the members of their community. It is only seemly that they should do so occasionally; but there is not the slightest obligation to do so.

33. The Days of Celebration.—With the exception of Vicars- and Prefects-Apostolic and their quasi-pastors,[61] all pastors of souls must celebrate Holy Mass for their people and apply the Mass for them *on every Sunday of the year and on all the holydays of obligation.* These holydays of obligation are the ones specified as such by Urban VIII or by one of his successors, *even tho the precept has been subsequently suppressed.* The *Codex* has made no change in this rule.

The following is the list of these feastdays, as given on December 28, 1919, by the Congregation of the Council: Christmas, the Circumcision, Epiphany, Easter and the two days following, Ascension, Pentecost and the two days following, Trinity, Corpus Christi, the Finding of the True Cross, Purification, Annunciation, Assumption, Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, Immaculate Conception, Dedication of St. Michael, Nativity of St. John the Baptist, the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, of St. Andrew, of St. James, of St. John the Evangelist, of St. Thomas, of St. Philip and St. James, of St. Bartholomew, of St. Matthew, of Sts. Simon and Jude, of St. Mathias, of St. Stephen, of the Holy Innocents, of St. Lawrence, of St. Sylvester, of St. Joseph, of St. Anne, of All Saints, of the Patron of the country, of the patron of the diocese, and of the patron of the locality[62] (but not the feast of the titular of the parish).

However, the feast of the patron of a country, a diocese, or a city does not entail the obligation of saying the Mass *pro populo* unless

---

61. In the case of Vicars- and Prefects-Apostolic, and of their quasi-pastors, the obligation includes only the following feasts: Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption, the feast of St. Joseph, the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, and All Saints (c.306).

As to the Orientals, they are bound to say Mass *pro populo*, since this is a divine law, but they are not subject to the ecclesiastical law which determines the number of Masses. The Holy See *desires*, however, that they follow, so far as possible, the discipline of the Western Church.

62. If a holyday of obligation, peculiar to a certain place, was established by a Pontifical Decree, it entails the obligation of the *Missa pro populo*.

On the other hand, the feasts established by episcopal decree, or by custom, or as a result of a vow made by the faithful, do not entail this obligation.

the choice of the patron was made by the people and approved by the Holy See.

34. On Christmas day, and whenever one of these holydays enumerated above falls on a Sunday, it is enough to say one Mass *pro populo* (c. 339, No. 2).

When a feast is transferred, and when on the day to which it is transferred the clergy are bound to say the Office and the Mass of the transferred feast, and the faithful are bound to assist at Mass and to abstain from servile works, then the Mass *pro populo* must be said on that day; otherwise, it is said on the day on which it normally falls (c. 339, No. 3).

It often happens, in France, for example, that the *external solemnity only* is transferred to the following Sunday (c. 1247, No. 2); in this case the Mass must be said on the day of incidence. The same holds good when the Office and the Mass are transferred, but not the solemnity (as is the case for all the holydays of obligation which have been suppressed and which are subject to transference). Thus, when the feast of the Annunciation falls on Holy Thursday, the Office and the Mass of the Annunciation are transferred, but the obligation of the Mass *pro populo* remains attached to Holy Thursday.[63]

35. When a Bishop is in charge of several dioceses, either as their real Bishop or as administrator, he satisfies the law by celebrating one single Mass for the intention of all the faithful under his care (c. 339, No. 5).

The same rule applies to a pastor who has charge of several parishes. Formerly he was obliged to say as many Masses as he had parishes; but since the promulgation of the *Codex,* he is bound to say only one (c. 466, No. 2).

On the contrary if a pastor is at the same time a Canon, and if on the same day he is bound to say the Mass *pro populo* in his capacity as pastor, and to say the conventual Mass in his capacity as Canon, he is compelled to discharge this twofold obligation. He will then say himself the conventual Mass, and have someone else

---

63. If the feast of the Annunciation falls on Good Friday, the obligation of the Mass *pro populo* disappears, since on that day all Masses are forbidden, and the feast, being no longer of obligation, has no transferred solemnity.
If it falls on Holy Saturday, the Mass must be said on that day; if the priest does not say Mass, he is not bound.
The same rule applies if another feast (for instance, that of the Patron) coincides with one of these days.

say the Mass *pro populo,* or say it himself on the first free day (c. 419, No. 2).

36. The Character of this Obligation.—

1. It is a duty that is first of all *personal,* that is to say, the pastor of souls (Bishop, pastor, etc.) must *himself* say the Mass on the days appointed. In case of serious obstacles,[64] (illness, celebration of the conventual Mass, *lawful* absence, or any other grave cause), he must arrange to have the Mass said by someone else, and if that is not possible, he must say it or have it said as soon as possible on another day (c. 339, No. 4).

This obligation is, in a measure, *de jure divino,* for the sacerdotal office of mediator is a personal charge. Therefore the Sovereign Pontiff does not permit a pastor to have the Mass *pro populo* said regularly, or even too often, by another.

2. Regularly, *pastors*[65] are bound to say the Mass *pro populo* in their parish church (c. 466, No. 4). The Church desires that the faithful may be able to assist at the Mass that is celebrated for them.[66]

However, this rule is subject to exceptions. When the pastor is absent from his parish (by a lawful absence) he can either say the Mass in the place where he is, or have it said by the priest who takes his place (c. 466, No. 5). He may also celebrate it in a chapel to which some special solemnity has drawn a considerable portion of his parishioners. Finally, when, *on suppressed holydays,* the attendance at Mass is not any more numerous than on ordinary days, he is not obliged to say this Mass in his church.

3. This Mass must be said *on the days appointed,* that is, on Sundays and the indicated holydays.

---

64. The Congregation of the Council does not regard as sufficient to justify confiding to another priest the Mass *pro populo,* the following reasons: the celebration of a funeral Mass, or a marriage Mass, or a foundation Mass, or the custom of celebrating this Mass at a late hour with chant and a homily.

65. Bishops, Prelates, and Abbots, are not bound by this law. They are not even obliged to celebrate within their own territory.

66. However, the pastor is not obliged (unless the contrary is prescribed in the diocesan statutes) to say the Mass that is commonly called the "parish Mass," that is, the one which is usually said at a late hour and celebrated with extra solemnity.

As to the homily, the *Codex* requires that it be given, not at the Mass *pro populo,* but at the Mass where the people are present in greatest numbers (c.1344, No. 1).

It is likewise a general rule that the Mass *pro populo* must be the Mass of the day, even when the solemnity of a transferred feast is being celebrated. An exception to this rule is made for the external solemnity of the feast of the principal Patron, and of the Dedication of the Church (New Rubrics, IV, 3). However, in France, because of an ancient custom, in churches where there is only one Mass, it may be the Mass of the feast whose solemnity is being observed (S.R.C., Jan. 14, 1914).

But, for a just reason, the Ordinary may permit a pastor to transfer to another day the Mass *pro populo* (c. 466, No. 3). One may consider as a sufficient cause the obligation of celebrating on that day a funeral Mass, an anniversary Mass, a marriage Mass, a founded Mass with a fixed date, or even an ordinary Mass asked for an urgent reason.

37. The Gravity of the Law.—The obligation of celebrating the Mass *pro populo* is grave, and no reason can dispense from it, whether poverty, or the paucity of the revenue of the benefice, or *illness,* or a contrary custom, even tho it be centenary (c. 339, No. 1). If, then, thru inadvertence, because of sickness or any other reason, a priest has neglected to conform to this law, even tho there was no sin on his part, he is obliged to say as soon as possible all the omitted Masses (c. 339, No. 6).

The Holy See alone, can, for a truly serious reason, suppress this obligation, or reduce the number of Masses to be celebrated.

38. It is certain that the omission of a single Mass *pro populo* constitutes a mortal sin. It is a sin against justice, and this neglect of the obligations of the pastoral office binds the delinquent to a partial restitution of the fruits of his benefice.

As regards the omission of particular circumstances relating to the person of the celebrant, the place, the time, this would constitute a mortal sin if it were repeated often and without reason. It would be only a venial sin to omit once (or even several times) one or another of these accessory prescriptions.

39. Dispensation from the Law.—The sovereign Pontiff certainly has the power to grant a dispensation from the law which obliges the pastors of souls to apply the Mass for their people. Nevertheless, as even he cannot suppress what is *de jure divino absoluto,* he cannot allow a residential Bishop *never* to say Mass *pro populo.* Such indults are given sometimes for very grave reasons[67] to certain priests directly; but more often they are given to Bishops to enable them to authorize their priests to accept a stipend for these Masses for the benefit of diocesan organizations.[68]

---

67. For example the extreme poverty of the petitioner. To secure a dispensation from the accessory regulations concerning the person of the celebrant, the time, and the place of saying Mass, a just and reasonable cause is sufficient.

68. These indults regard either the Mass of suppressed feasts, or even the Mass of the Sunday or of a holyday of obligation, but the exemption is never absolute. The Holy See ordinarily imposes the celebration of one Mass a month for the intentions of the parish.

In such cases, the stipend must be sent in its entirety to the Bishop; and even the Bishop cannot permit the priest to keep whatever surplus there might be over the regular diocesan stipend. However, this general rule is subject to exceptions: the celebrant could keep for himself the surplus over the regular diocesan stipend if he had a reason independent of the celebration properly so called of the mass (*titulus extrinsecus*), for example, if this surplus had for its purpose to compensate him for the special inconvenience caused him by the Mass *pro populo* (the lateness of the hour, the singing, etc.), or if such was the *expressed* will of the giver of the stipend.

40. When it is a question of Masses *pro populo* which have been omitted in good faith, or even in bad faith, and which the priest cannot, for truly serious reasons, say, the Holy See can grant *condonations* or *sanations* more or less ample.

For the *forum internum* it is the Penitenciary which gives the *sanatio;* for the *forum externum,* it is the Congregation of the Council when one of the diocesan clergy is concerned, the Congregation of Religious if the petitioner is a member of a religious order, the Propaganda if he is a Vicar- or Prefect-Apostolic or a quasi-pastor.

In the petition, the supplicant must set forth the number of Masses omitted, he must tell whether the omission was made in good or in bad faith, and he must explain the reasons which make it impossible or very difficult to repair these omissions. The Holy See, even when it grants the favor asked, imposes the application of a certain number of Masses.[69]

Article III.—The Obligation Resulting from the Acceptance of a Stipend

41. The Lawfulness of Mass Stipends.—The custom of giving an honorarium to a priest to have him say Mass for a particular intention, goes back at least to the 8th century; cases may be found in the 7th and the 6th century. Little by little it supplanted the

---

69. If a priest dies without having said the Masses *pro populo* which he had omitted, his heirs would be bound to have them said; for the Mass *pro populo* is a real charge, and hence there is a debt which binds the heirs. In practice it will oftentimes be difficult to make them understand this obligation. But the refusal of the heirs does not oblige anybody to ask a *sanatio* from the Holy See; the obligation of saying Mass for the parishioners ceases with the death of the pastor.

much more ancient custom (dating back to the beginning of the 2d century) of the offerings, a portion of which constituted the matter for the sacrifice, and the remainder, after the blessed bread had been removed, served for the sustenance of the clergy. By the 12th century, the custom of giving Mass-stipends was common thruout the whole Church.

The *Codex* ratifies this custom; it declares explicitly that "in accordance with the custom received and approved in the Church, every priest is permitted to accept an honorarium for the celebration and the application[70] of the Sacrifice of the Mass" (c. 824, No. 1).

It is certain that the Church, in the course of the centuries, has many times approved this custom and condemned the doctrines (Synod of Pistoia, Wyclif, the Protestants), which denounced it as an abuse. Moreover, the faithful are obliged to support their priests, and this duty binds in a special manner those who derive from the ministry of the priest special spiritual advantages. St. Paul taught that "those who serve the altar must live by the altar;" and the word of Our Lord is still more explicit: "The laborer is worthy of his hire" (Matt. 10/10; Luke, 10/7).

42. Some have attacked this custom, saying that it reeks of simony. This is an error, for the stipend is not to be looked upon as the payment for the Mass, nor even for the labor entailed in its celebration, but only as a means for the priest to earn his livelihood and to support his strength. Amongst the conditions necessary for the discharge of the priest's duties, must be reckoned the food required for his health; it is a condition of the exercise of his ministry, even as bread, wine, wax, vestments, etc. He has, therefore, the right to demand in justice that all these means be provided him so that he may gratuitously procure for the faithful the graces which they expect from the Holy Sacrifice.[71]

This reasoning holds good in the case of every priest, even tho

---

70. When a person gives a priest a Mass-stipend, it is always supposed that he asks for the celebration of the Mass and also for the application of the ministerial fruit according to his intention. However, the two things are separable, and *if there were no doubt* that the giver of the stipend desired merely the celebration of the Mass, the priest could accept another stipend for the application of the fruit of that Mass (c.825, No. 4).

71. "A painter," says de Lugo (disp. 21, n. 13), "who has made a vow not to sell his paintings, but to paint for nothing, may nevertheless ask the person who employs him to furnish him with colors, brushes, etc.... and to *board* him; in a word, he may demand all that he needs for his work, and these demands would not be a price for his labor, but only the indispensable means for its accomplishment. This is what the priest does when he demands a stipend."

he may have sufficient resources besides. For no one is bound to perform at his own expense a task which promotes the good of others. As to the various revenues of ecclesiastical origin, they are given in compensation for special labors, and they do not oblige him who receives them to celebrate Holy Mass gratuitously.[72]

43. In cases of concelebration (the Oriental rites, the Mass of ordination, the Mass of the consecration of a bishop), all those who celebrate have the right to accept a stipend. There is a special ministerial fruit which corresponds to the offering of each of the concelebrants, even as tho he were celebrating alone. It is certain, therefore, that a young priest may accept a stipend for the Mass of his ordination, just as the Orientals do for Masses of concelebration.

44. The Nature of this Obligation.—The priest is bound in *justice* (the result of a quasi-contract) to say the Mass for the intention of the person who has given him a stipend, just as the lay person is bound in justice to give the priest the stipend promised when the Mass was asked for.

All authors agree that the obligation is *grave* when the stipend constitutes a grave matter. And practically all, especially in these days, teach that the priest is bound *sub gravi* to celebrate, even when the stipend represents only a trifling matter. The gravity of the matter, they say, is not reckoned by the stipend, but by the grave damage done to him who has asked for the Mass, and who, thru the fault of the priest, is deprived of the fruits of the sacrifice.[73]

As a matter of fact, the *Codex* prescribes the celebrating and the applying of as many Masses as one has received stipends, tho they may be of slight value[74] (c. 828). This takes it for granted, however, that the priest, before accepting a stipend, has had the opportunity of seeing what is offered him; and, even after accepting it,

---

72. A priest who has no other purpose in saying Mass than to secure a stipend, would evidently be blamable; but he would not be guilty of simony, unless we regard the stipend as the *price of the Mass.* Money may, indeed, be the motive which induces him to say Mass, but it does not follow from that that the priest dreams of bartering the fruits of the Mass for that money.

73. Father Lehmkuhl, and with him certain recent theologians, holds that if a priest, after having accepted a *large number* of Masses *for the same intention,* said one less than the number stipulated (99 instead of 100), it would perhaps be extreme to consider him guilty of mortal sin (II, 269, 1).

74. If a priest neglected to say a Mass for which he had accepted a small stipend, he would be bound to restitution only *sub levi;* but he would be bound, *sub gravi,* to say the promised Mass.

if the sum is really insignificant, he is bound (*sub levi*) to celebrate the Mass rather because of his promise than because of the stipend received.

45. The obligation to celebrate the Mass binds the priest *as soon as he has received the stipend;* and it persists even tho the stipend be lost *without any fault on his part* (c. 829), for example, if the money is lost or stolen.

It is, therefore, at the moment when the stipend is received that the contract is closed between the priest and the giver. Consequently, the priest is not held responsible if, even after his promise to celebrate the Masses, the letter which contains the stipends goes astray.

46. Various Kinds of Stipends.—From the viewpoint of the stipend, there are three categories of Masses:

1. *Manual* Masses, the stipends for which are given by the faithful directly to the priest, either thru personal devotion, or to satisfy an obligation (temporal or perpetual) imposed by a last will and testament (c. 826, No. 1).

2. *Foundation* Masses, the stipends for which come from certain properties (money or the equivalent) given to a moral person approved by the Church, with the obligation of seeing to the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice for a certain space of time or forever (c. 1544, No. 1).

3. Masses *ad instar manualium,* that is, *foundation* Masses which cannot be celebrated in the place specified or by the priest specified in the act of foundation, and which, with the permission of the founders or by virtue of an indult, are entrusted to other priests or sent to other places (c. 826, No. 2).

We shall have more to say further on concerning Foundation Masses. (n. 74).

47. The Determination of Mass Stipends.—The Ordinary of the place[75] has the right to fix the stipend for Masses in his diocese, and it should be, so far as possible, by a decree issued in the diocesan synod (c. 831, No. 1).

---

75. This word refers to the Bishops, Abbots, and Prelates *nullius,* Vicars- and Prefects-Apostolic. Although the *Codex* says nothing on this point, it is probable that the Vicar General has no right to fix the amount of the Mass-stipends, any more than the Chapter or the Vicar Capitular *sede vacante.* Regularly, it is in a synod that the fixing of the Mass-stipends is arranged; and in synods, the Bishop is the sole legislator.

If the synod cannot be held, or if there is any other just reason, the Bishop may do this alone. Unless there are special circumstances to consider, his decree shall extend to all parts of his diocese; there is nothing to prevent the stipend from varying according to the days and the hour of celebrating, or according to the difficulty of access to a sanctuary, etc., but it is not required, as some authors formerly maintained, that the stipend shall be large enough to provide for the support of the celebrant for a whole day; for the priest normally has other resources (benefice, gifts, perquisites), and the stipend of the Mass is to provide for only a portion of his support.

If there is no episcopal decree on the subject of Mass stipends, the custom of the diocese is to be followed (c. 831, No. 2), provided that it possesses all the qualities that give it the force of law (consequently, it must have been in force at least forty years), and that it is in force thruout the whole diocese. There is nothing to prevent the Bishop from modifying this custom.

48. The episcopal decree (or the custom of the diocese) binds religious, even exempt religious (c. 831, No. 3), as well as the diocesan clergy; and both classes of priests are forbidden, not only to demand, but even to *ask* for a sum larger than the regular tariff. To demand anything more would be contrary to commutative justice, and the priest would be bound to restitution.[76]

It is also certain that it would be a *mortal sin* not only to ask for a considerably greater sum, but even to demand habitually or frequently a slightly greater sum. For there would always be, in this mode of procedure, a gravely culpable violation of a law of the Church.

49. On the contrary, however, there is no law which forbids the *accepting* of a stipend which is spontaneously offered, and which is larger than the diocesan tariff (c. 832).[77]

It is even permitted, *unless it has been explicitly prohibited,* to ask something more than the regular tariff, when there is a special

76. It is even more probable that this priest would be guilty of simony, since, having no claim whereby to justify his demands, he cannot regard this surplus as other than the price for the spiritual fruits of the sacrifice; and this is the very definition of simony. His guilt will depend on his intention; but, in the *forum externum,* he must be regarded as simoniacal.

77. What is one to do when he receives stipends which are less than the diocesan tax? One may return them to the giver, or, if the giver is unknown, send them to the Ordinary, who may have an indult which permits him to convert these stipends according to the diocesan tax. An indult is not even necessary when the diocesan tariff has been regularly made known to the faithful.

reason *independent of the sacrifice properly so called.* This surplus is intended to serve as compensation for what is called the *extrinsic* labor of the Mass; we may regard as such extrinsic labor, the special fatigue which is entailed by singing the Mass, or by saying it at a late hour; likewise, the enduring of some inconvenience, or the exposing oneself to some danger.... But in such cases the surplus must be exactly proportioned to the supplementary labor; and it is also stipulated that this labor must not be already necessitated by any other consideration (office, foundation, contract, etc.).

50. De jure communi, a priest is not forbidden to accept a stipend which is lower than the diocesan tariff (c. 832), relinquishing in this manner a portion of his right. Nevertheless the Church can forbid this practice,[78] for this spontaneous reduction may be an injury to other priests who need for their support the full stipend.

51. When a priest is given a sum of money, without any stipulation concerning the number of stipends, he must determine this, no longer in accordance with the tariff of the diocese where the Masses are to be said (as was formerly the law), but in accordance with the tariff of the diocese where the giver of the stipend is at the moment; unless, indeed, he has manifested a contrary intention (c. 830), for example, by previously asking what is the diocesan tariff for Mass stipends.

Therefore, as a general rule, if a priest belonging to a diocese where the stipend is 5 francs, receives 200 francs for Masses from a diocese where the stipend is 4 francs, he must say 50 Masses (not 40), unless he decides to refuse the stipends.

52. The Transmission of Mass-Stipends.—The *Codex* is less severe on this matter than the previous decrees, especially the decree *Recenti decreto* (May 22, 1907). The *Codex* permits every priest who has in his possession Mass-stipends which have been left to his free disposal, to transmit them to other priests,[79] even

78. Even then a priest is not forbidden to accept a lesser stipend if there is, on his part, the explicit intention of *giving an alms* to the giver of the stipend, and if the latter deserves this liberality.

79. It is not allowed to send these stipends to booksellers or other merchants who will send books or other goods instead of money to the priest who will say the Masses. But it is not forbidden to send them to a priest who undertakes to distribute them to other priests who are in need.

Certain organizations (for the diffusion of good books or papers) sometimes obtain indults which permit them to collect stipends and to retain a small portion of them or to offer subscriptions in place of them. In such cases it is not forbidden to send stipends to such organizations.

outside his own diocese,[80] provided that he knows them to be without suspicion, or that they present a recommendation from their Ordinary (c. 838).

This is a right which the Ordinary cannot take away from his priests! It is likewise most probable that he cannot impose on them the obligation to secure his consent before sending Mass-stipends outside the diocese.[81] But this right applies only to stipends which have been left to their free disposal; the Ordinary can forbid the sending outside the diocese of foundation Masses, Masses *ad instar manualium*, and also of stipends that are sent yearly, not directly to the priest himself and for himself, but to a sanctuary, a place of pilgrimage, or the office of a pious association. As regards Mass-stipends left in wills, the Ordinary can forbid their transmission, but only in cases where it appears imprudent to him, or not in conformity with the intentions of the testator.

53. When a priest transmits Mass-stipends, he is not rid of his obligations until he has received notice that his stipends *have reached their destination*[81a] (c. 839).

This notice may be given *viva voce* or in writing; a receipt from the Post Office answers the same purpose. (The endorsement on the cancelled check will also suffice. TRANSLATOR.) If the stipends disappear before reaching their destination, it is the sender who is responsible for them.

54. The whole stipend must be sent to the priest who is to say the Mass; not even the slightest portion of it can be retained.

The priest who would act otherwise would be sinning against justice; he would be appropriating money which could be his only on condition that he said the Masses asked for;[82] this condition was

---

80. It is, however, forbidden to send stipends directly to priests belonging to an Oriental rite; stipends are to be furnished them only through the Congregation for the Oriental Church, through the apostolic delegates, or through their own Bishop..

81. A certain provincial council forbade the sending of stipends out of the diocese without the permission of the Ordinary; the Congregation of the Council then (Feb. 19, 1921) declared that this ruling applied only to foundation Masses, or Masses *ad instar manualium*, or to manual Masses which are given *intuitu causae piae* (A.A.S., XIII, p. 230).

81a. It is no longer necessary, therefore, to demand a certificate of the celebration of the Mass, as the decree *Ut debita* stipulated.

82. Certain authors have maintained that the giver of the stipend exacts only one thing, namely, the celebration of the Masses asked for. Hence no wrong would be done him by transmitting a stipend inferior to the one he gave, since his intention is complied with. As to the *priest* who retains a portion of the stipend, he does not act in opposition to the will of the giver of the stipend, who wished in this manner to contribute to the support of the clergy.

But this argument is sophistical. The giver of the stipend does, indeed, wish to help the priest, but on condition that that priest celebrate the Masses asked for; otherwise

not fulfilled, and hence he has no claim whatever to the money. He would therefore be bound (*sub gravi* or *sub levi,* according to the importance of the sum kept back) to make restitution; and the restitution must be made *to the priest who has celebrated the Masses.* If this priest cannot be reached, then the money can be given to pious undertakings, or, better still, for having Masses said for the giver of the stipends.

The intention of helping charitable societies by holding back a portion of the stipends, does not in any wise change this ruling; and the Bishop has no power to authorize such a practice, even for the purpose of using the money for the support or beautifying of a church that is without resources.[83]

55. This general rule has, however, some exceptions. The *Codex* mentions two of them.

1. The giver of the stipend can authorize the priest to whom he sends a stipend larger than the regular tariff, to keep back a portion of it and to send to the celebrant of the Mass only the regular stipend.

2. It may be that the surplus over the regular stipend has been given to the priest *intuitu personae,* out of friendship for that particular priest, or out of gratitude to him, or for the purpose of relieving his poverty. If this intention is *certain,* (for example, when the giver of the stipend sends to a poor priest who is his relative, a stipend much larger than the regular tariff), the priest is allowed to keep the surplus and to transmit only the regular tariff[84] (c. 840, No. 1).

---

the priest would have no claim on the money. What he wishes is, indeed, a certain number of Masses; but he has fixed a special stipend for them, with the idea, perhaps, that an unusually large offering would secure for him an unusually large share in the fruits of the sacrifice. Consequently the priest who transmits to another priest the obligation of saying these Masses, has no right to retain a portion of the stipend.

83. However, when the church is really poor, the rector is allowed, when distributing Masses to be said *in his church,* to keep a small part of the stipend, that is, the portion which corresponds to the expenses incurred in the celebration of the Mass. In this case, in order to avoid abuses, it is better to have the Bishop himself determine the tax to be levied on priests who ask to say Mass in a poor church. This decree, which should be issued by the Bishop, and, so far as possible, in synod, or, in any case, after consultation with the Chapter, will have the force of law throughout the diocese; and no one can demand more, under pain of restitution (c. 1303).

When one sends stipends abroad, it is not allowed to keep the difference in exchange; the stipend just as it was received must be sent to the celebrant. But it is allowed to retain the cost of sending the money.

84. A priest who receives a legacy of a certain number of stipends determined by the testator and higher than the regular tariff, may, if he has those Masses said by another priest, transmit only the regular stipend and keep the surplus because it is a legacy A mere *executor of a will* could not do this.

Moreover, it is quite evident that the priest to whom a stipend is sent may relinquish a portion of it, and the intermediary then has a perfect right to accept it. But in order to avoid all suspicion of unlawful commerce, it is necessary that this concession be fully spontaneous and free, that it was not suggested by the intermediary or inspired in the celebrant by the fear of receiving no more stipends.

56. As regards *foundation Masses,* the rule is somewhat different. These Masses have habitually a higher tariff, because they constitute a portion of the maintenance of the chaplain who is charged with saying them, or because they constitute a portion of the revenue of a pious institution. Unless the founder has expressed himself to the contrary, it is allowed to presume that such is his will. Consequently, when one is authorized, either by virtue of the foundation itself, or by virtue of an indult from the Holy See, to have these Masses said outside the place of foundation, it is permissible to send only the regular stipend, that is, the sum corresponding to the tariff of the diocese *where the Masses are to be celebrated*[85] (c. 840, No. 2).

57. On the contrary, if anyone (priest or laic) collects stipends in order to distribute them afterwards, he must transmit the whole sum, even if it is larger than the diocesan stipend; to keep anything permission must be had from the givers of the stipends, or an indult must be secured from the Holy See.[86]

Such an indult the Holy See most certainly can grant, and does actually grant, rarely in the interest of a private person, more often, and with stipulations varying according to the case, in favor of a pious institution which is without resources.

58. In addition to this benevolent transmission of Mass-stipends, the *Codex* mentions another and obligatory kind of transmission.

---

85. It may be that certain stipends are in some way a portion of the support of the pastor, or are included amongst the *jura stolae* (funeral Masses, marriage Masses, etc.). In this case, the pastor who does not say these Masses himself, may send only the sum corresponding to the regular tariff of the diocese in which the Masses are to be said.—But ordinarily the increase in the stipend corresponds to a special consideration (or the lateness of the hour), and then it is not allowed to retain anything.

86. Certain authors (Ojetti, Synopsis, c. 3827, Lehmkuhl, n. 281, Gasparri, n. 609) admit that this indult is not necessary if the collector of the stipends has received permission from his superiors and if he takes only a small compensation. To a question put by the Archbishop of Tarragona on this subject, the Congregation of the Council replied by granting *for five years* an indult permitting the collector to keep for himself three per cent of the sum collected.

At the end of every year, all those who, under any title, have charge of saying Masses or having them said, must send into their Ordinary the stipends which have not yet been fulfilled[87] (c. 841, No. 1).

The Ordinary referred to is the Ordinary of the place, so far as the diocesan clergy, non-exempt religious, and the laity are concerned; for the exempt religious clerics, it is their major Superior.

This rule means that the Masses *ad instar manualium* (foundation Masses not celebrated in the place of foundation) must be sent to the Ordinary at the end of December of the year in which they should have been celebrated, and *manual* Masses when twelve months have passed since they were received.

These periods, however, have nothing mathematical about them, and the priest is not obliged, in order to obey the law, to totally deprive himself of stipends. Moreover, with the permission of the givers of the stipends (c. 841, No. 2), he may keep the stipends which he has received for longer than a year.

59. Moreover, the *Codex* makes it a duty for Ordinaries and Superiors to see that the Masses, founded or manual, shall be regularly celebrated (c. 842). They must see, in particular, that the rectors of churches or chapels have a special register in which to record the number, the intention, the quality of the Masses and the date of their celebration, and they must inspect these registers every year, either personally or by a delegate (c. 843).[88]

Ordinaries and Religious Superiors are also bound to keep a register in which they shall inscribe the Mass intentions which are given them; and they must, so far as possible, have these Masses said immediately (c. 844, No. 1).

Ordinaries and Religious Superiors, because of their rank and station, often receive from the faithful and from their priests, a great abundance of Mass stipends; it is not always an easy matter to insure their speedy celebration; and the Church urges them to use their best efforts in this regard.

In this case, the period of delay for the celebration of the Masses begins with the moment when the Ordinary, not the giver of the stipend, sends the stipend to the celebrant.

60. Finally all priests, diocesan or regular, are bound by the

87. This precept is grave, and it would certainly be a mortal sin to keep Mass-stipends for several years, without explicit authorization.

88. In churches, even parochial churches, which belong to exempt religious clerics, this control is vested exclusively in the superiors.

Codex to keep a careful record of the Mass intentions that they receive as well as of their celebration (c. 844, No. 2).

From the importance of the matter, this obligation must be looked upon as grave. It would be sinful negligence to expose oneself to a forgetfulness whose consequences are often disastrous and can involve successors or heirs in inextricable difficulties.

61. Commerce in Mass-Stipends.—With regard to Mass-stipends, even the appearance of commerce or traffic must be avoided[89] (c. 827). The *Codex* has not retained against offenders in this matter the punishments *latae sententiae* issued by the decree *Ut debita,* but it does permit the Ordinary to punish them according to the gravity of their offense, even with suspension, privation of their office, and excommunication (c. 2324).

Consequently, it is forbidden to collect stipends and have Masses said at a lower rate, either at home or in a diocese where the tariff is lower, even if the sum thus gained is devoted to the maintenance of a church or of pious institutions, and even if the collector has previously secured the consent of the celebrant.[90] It is likewise forbidden, as a general rule, to give, instead of the stipends collected, books or other merchandise; for this exchange is ordinarily only a traffic in disguise.

62. It may be however, that such an exchange, especially if it is practiced only rarely, has no commercial aspect. In such a case it would not be forbidden, for the *Codex,* less severe than the decree *Ut debita,* seeks to prohibit only commerce in Mass-stipends, and does not absolutely forbid the giving, instead of the sum received, an object of equal value.

So, too, there is nothing to prevent a bookseller or a merchant

---

89. Business in general, is an exchange, by means of buying and selling, of things which have a money value (objects, bankable paper, money), with a view to making a profit; commerce properly so called (*mercatura*) supposes an exchange of merchandise (*merces*).

As regards Mass-stipends, there would be "business" if one were to gather stipends in order to have them said at a lower rate and thus secure a profit; there is the "appearance of business" if one were to act thus with the consent of the celebrant of the Masses; there would be "commerce" if, instead of the stipends which one had collected, one were to forward, *with profit,* books or other objects; there would be the "appearance of commerce," if one were to derive no material profit by thus acting.

90. However, in this last case, it would not be a sin against justice, and the priest who had collected and distributed the stipends would not be bound to restitution. Indeed, when the stipends are not collected *with the intention* to distribute them at a profit, it is not forbidden, in order to relieve poverty or to aid a pious society, to ask of the celebrant a portion of the stipend that is given him; for in this there is no appearance of business, provided that the request is not a downright demand.

from offering a priest a book, a subscription to a review, or some other object, asking him to say one or two Masses in return. There is nothing to prevent a priest from accepting as stipends, wine, wheat, etc., or from paying off a debt by saying Masses. The Director of a society may accept stipends, and, if he finds priests who agree to celebrate *gratuitously*[91] the Masses asked for, he can use the money for his own institution. A vicar, in order to pay his pastor for his board and lodging, may celebrate Masses for which the pastor has received the stipends, etc. Nevertheless, some of these forms of exchange may easily take on the appearance of commerce, or may lead to commerce properly so called; therefore they are to be regulated with great prudence.

63. Finally, there is no reason why two priests may not exchange their intentions without exchanging the corresponding stipends, even tho one of them may thus derive a pecuniary advantage from the transaction.[92] For in this case, each of them celebrates gratuitously and relinquishes to his confrere the whole stipend of the Mass, a thing which all authors declare quite permissible. What would be reprehensible would be to collect rich stipends with the intention of profiting by them by the means of exchange; for this practice would have no other reason than to procure to the priest a material advantage thru an out-and-out commercial transaction.

64. The Secondary Obligations of the Celebrant.—In general, it is lawful to presume that he who transmits a stipend demands nothing more than the application of the Mass. But it is within his rights to explicitly determine certain special circumstances, and in such a case, the celebrant is bound to observe them (c. 833). This is, in fact, an obligation of justice, since the circumstances form a part of the contract.

These particularities may refer to the time, the place, or the quality of the Mass, or to the person of the celebrant.

---

91. It may appear strange that theologians permit a priest who receives a stipend to ask a confrere to say Mass gratuitously for that intention and to keep the stipend for himself, while they forbid asking a celebrant for a *portion* of the stipend. This is because the first named practice can have only slight and rare drawbacks, while the second may very easily and speedily give rise to serious and manifold abuses.

92. A priest receives a considerable stipend for saying Mass on a certain day; but when that day comes, it is not possible for him to say Mass for that intention. He may then say to a confrere: "Will you say Mass today for my intention? Tomorrow I shall say Mass for your intention, and each of us will keep the stipend that we have received." This agreement, freely entered into, contains a mutual and total concession of the stipend attached to the Mass celebrated.

65. 1. The Time.—The giver of the stipend may determine explicitly the day when the Mass is to be celebrated; and the priest must observe this condition which he has accepted. (c. 834, No. 1). The obligation will be grave or light according to the nature of the motive which inspired the condition.[93] When the selection of a certain day had no special reason, or only a reason of devotion, there is no sin at all, or only a slight sin in not conforming to it; but there must be some reason for failing to conform to it.

In other cases, even tho the giver of the stipend does not fix the date, the date is clearly specified by the reason which inspired the asking for the Mass, v.g., a cure to be obtained, an examination or an operation to be undergone, etc.; and in such cases, the Mass must be said as soon as possible, and *in tempore utili* (c. 834, No. 2, n. 1). It would in such cases be a mortal sin to delay the celebration of the Mass until it would be impossible to secure the desired grace; for example, to wait, without sufficient reason, until after the death of a person for whose recovery the stipend for the Mass was given.

66. When Mass-stipends have not been given for any urgent cause, they are to be celebrated in a relatively short time, taking into consideration the number of the Masses asked for (c. 834, No. 2. n. 2). The decree *Ut debita* (May 11, 1904), and a response given by the Congregation of the Council (*Leopolien,* Feb. 27, 1905), regulated as follows the delays to be permitted. Not exceeding ten Masses, one month; not exceeding twenty Masses, two months; not exceeding forty Masses, three months; and so on, adding a delay of one month for every twenty Masses.[94] And at the present time this declaration constitutes an excellent interpretation of the *Codex* on the matter; one cannot do better than to

---

93. It may be that the circumstance of time was, in the mind of the giver of the stipend, a condition *sine qua non;* in that case an anticipation or a delay of any kind would be absolutely contrary to the nature of the contract accepted by the priest, and the application of the Mass would be invalid. For instance: someone asks to have a Mass said on a feast day *so that* the faithful may satisfy the precept, and the priest says the Mass on an ordinary day; or, someone asks to have a Mass said *to obtain the cure* of a sick person, and the priest says the Mass after the person is dead.

Nevertheless, as a general rule, this circumstance of time is only secondary in the mind of the giver of the stipend, and the priest satisfies his obligations by the saying of the Mass.

94. These delays are referred to Masses coming from the same person. For thirty Masses received on the same day from different persons, the delay allowed is only one month; if these stipends come from the same person, the delay allowed is three months.

The Sovereign Pontiff alone has the power to extend the delays sanctioned by the *Codex.*

conform strictly to it. However, a delay of two or three days would not be a sin; a delay of from ten to fifteen days would be only a venial sin; but a delay of several months, according to the opinion of moral theologians, would be a mortal sin.[95]

67. The rule given above does not apply, of course, in cases where the giver of the stipend *explicitly* permits the priest to determine the date of the celebration of the Mass. The celebrant can in such cases select any day that suits him (c. 834, No. 3).

However, heed must be given to the Canon which forbids any priest to collect *for himself*[96] more Mass-stipends than he can satisfy in a year (c. 835). Regularly,[97] therefore, the priest must, within a year (dating from the day of their reception) celebrate all the Masses that have been given him with entire latitude as to the date of their celebration.

68. To facilitate an understanding between priests and people on this subject, the *Codex* commands that in churches where there is an abundance of Mass-stipends, the faithful shall be notified by means of a bulletin posted up in the church, that the Masses will be celebrated either in the church itself *as soon as it is possible to do so,* or elsewhere (c. 836).

69. 2. The Place.—In general the place where the Mass is to be celebrated is an accidental circumstance which does not prevent the valid application of the Mass, unless it has been stipulated by the giver of the stipend as an essential condition of contract.

It would be a mortal sin to disregard this circumstance, only if a considerable damage should result from it to a family or a parish. Heed should also be given to the motive which induced the giver of the stipend to specify the place; if this motive is of little import-

---

95. Foundation anniversary Masses cannot be transferred unless there is a physical or moral impossibility to say them on the day fixed.

When there is a rule that the foundation Masses shall be said every day, or on the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of every week, the priest who says Mass only on the last three days of Holy Week is not bound to supply the Masses missed, unless he receives a special stipend for each Mass.

On All Souls Day and on Christmas day, in order to satisfy a *daily* foundation, it is enough, unless the contrary is explicitly stipulated, to say only one Mass for the intention of the founder.

96. Unless the contrary is explicitly stipulated, it is allowed to presume that the giver of the stipend is willing that the Masses he asks for shall be said elsewhere and by other priests; and the priest is secure in conscience provided he sends to the Ordinary, at the expiration of the permitted time of delay, the Masses which he has not been able to say.

97. We say *regularly*, because, with the permission of the giver of the stipend, it is allowed to keep stipends for more than a year. But the Church has seen fit, by means of a special prescription, to prohibit an accumulation of stipends which is not without serious dangers.

ance, the neglect of the priest to observe it, unless this neglect were habitual or too frequent, would be only a venial sin; and any reasonable cause would excuse it from all sin.[98]

70. Some have wondered in particular if a priest satisfied his obligations by celebrating at an ordinary altar, a Mass which he had been asked to say at a privileged altar. He would, most certainly, if he enjoyed the *personal* privilege of the altar; if he did not enjoy that personal privilege, the Congregation of Indulgences has declared that the obligation would not be satisfied, and that the defect would not be remedied by merely gaining another and different indulgence and applying it to the departed soul for whom the Mass was celebrated[99] (May 2, 1852). Nevertheless, this decree leaves unimpaired the favor accorded by the same Congregation (Feb. 22, 1847) to any priest who, *in good faith,* shall overlook this circumstance of the privileged altar; to be released from his obligation, he has only to gain another plenary indulgence and apply it according to the intention of the giver of the stipend.[100]

71. 3. The Quality of the Mass.—As a general rule, it is permissible to presume that this circumstance is only accidental in the intention of the giver of the stipend. What he has in mind is the application of the ministerial fruit of the Mass to a special intention; and this application does not in any wise depend on the quality (rite or solemnity) of the Mass.

Therefore when a laic asks to have a Mass said for a deceased person, it is not necessary to say a *Requiem* Mass, even on days when such a Mass is permitted by the rubrics.[101] Likewise it is permissible to say a Requiem Mass for the intention of a living person. The application will always be valid, unless the giver of the stipend has *explicitly declared* that this circumstance of the quality of the Mass is essential to his demand.

---

98. If the place designated by the giver of the stipend or by the author of a foundation becomes unusable for divine worship, the Ordinary may designate another church. But as a general rule, unless the right has been given to the Ordinary by the givers of the stipend, only the Holy See has the power to make a modification in the secondary circumstances of Mass-intentions.

99. This is because the indulgence of the privileged altar does not depend on the dispositions of the priest, and because it has more certain effects than those of an ordinary indulgence.

100. One may, it would seem, extend this privilege to cases where a grave reason, physical or moral, prevents the priest from saying Mass at the privileged altar.

101. The Holy See has expressly declared that a priest satisfies the obligations contracted towards the dead by saying the Mass of the day; however, when it is possible, it is more in conformity with the mind of the Church to say a Requiem Mass (S.R.C., June 13, 1899).

72. The giver of the stipend, without going so far as to make this circumstance an essential condition, may *explicitly ask* for a Requiem or a Votive Mass. It would then be at least a venial sin not to conform with his intention when the rubrics permit. It is certain, for instance, that the special orations in the Mass for the Dead increase the *impetratory* fruit of the sacrifice.[102] And therefore certain authors would compel the priest who said the Mass of the day instead of the Requiem Mass asked for by the giver of the stipend to apply to the soul of the deceased the *suffrages* of the first Requiem Mass that he says afterwards. In all this matter, one cannot be too exact in following the requests made.

In like manner, if the giver of the stipend has asked for a solemn or sung Mass, the application of a simple Mass would certainly be valid; but the priest would not satisfy his obligations. And he must subsequently celebrate a solemn or sung Mass and apply, to the intention of the giver of the stipend, the special fruit resulting from the solemnity; as to the ministerial fruit, he may dispose of that according to another intention.

73. Personal Celebration.—It is permissible to *presume* that the giver of the stipend does not demand that the Mass be celebrated by the person to whom the stipend is given. Even when he has specially mentioned the celebrant, the latter would be guilty of only a venial sin if he had the Mass said by another priest, unless the giver of the stipend would be too much put out by the change; and a reasonable cause would excuse from all sin.

Article IV.—Foundations of Masses

74. By foundations of Masses we mean the entrusting to a moral ecclesiastical person (a church, an institute, or any other pious place), of temporal goods (oftentimes a sum of money) the revenue from which is to serve to insure, forever or for a certain space of time, the celebration of one or several Masses (c. 1544, No. 1).

---

102. In the Mass, says St. Thomas (Suppl., q. 71, a. 9), we are to consider not merely the sacrifice, but also the prayers; but in the prayers of Requiem Masses, the Church asks more expressly and directly the deliverance of the souls in Purgatory from their punishments.—Elsewhere the great Doctor acknowledges that the special fruit which results from the liturgical prayers may be compensated for by the greater devotion with which the celebrant says the Mass of the day, or by the intercession of the saint who is honored in that Mass.

A foundation can be made by an agreement amongst living persons, or by a last will and testament; it can be made orally, but in this case it must be set forth in writing as soon as possible, and a copy of the agreement must be kept in the archives of the diocese, and another given to the moral person which will have charge of the foundation (c. 1548). To make it binding in conscience, it is not necessary (altho it is much to be desired) that the foundation should be established according to the requirements of civil law[103] (c. 1513).

75. The following are the four conditions which must be fulfilled in every foundation of Masses.

1. The regular *acceptance* by the moral person (chapter, seminary, parish, confraternity, etc.) to whom the foundation is entrusted. A foundation of Masses is a synallagmatic contract: *do ut facias.* The donation is valid only from the moment that it is accepted; if the donator dies or retracts his donation before it is accepted, the foundation is no longer possible. It is well, therefore, to accept desirable offers of foundations as promptly as possible.

2. *The written consent of the Ordinary of the place,* that is, of the Bishop, the Vicar-General, or the Vicar Capitular, if it is a question of a diocesan institution; and of the major Prelate or Superior, if it is a question of foundations made in a church belonging to exempt religious.

Before giving this consent, the Ordinary should make certain that the moral person who is to accept the foundation is able to bear the burden without detriment to those with which it is already charged. He must above all make sure that the revenues are in keeping with the obligations imposed taking into consideration the customs of each diocese[104] (c. 1546).

The Ordinary also has the right to determine the amount of revenue necessary for the foundation and the manner of distribution of these revenues (c. 1545). The tariff for foundation Masses will evidently be higher than the tariff for manual Masses, since it is a question of a perpetual charge, since it is possible that

---

103. Although "diocesan associations" may be authorized to accept foundations "for religious ceremonies and services," either by a contract with the living, or by legacy, it will be wise to think the matter over before having recourse to this means.

104. When the church is subject to the right of patronage, the patron has no right in the acceptance, the constitution, and the administration of the foundations (c. 1546, No. 2).

the revenues may suffer a diminution, and since a portion of these revenues is to be employed to cover the cost of administration.[105]

A foundation accepted without the consent of the Ordinary would be illicit, but valid. The *Codex* does not require this consent under pain of nullity. However, if the foundation is not in conformity with the canonical prescriptions (for example, if it is detrimental to the interests of the church or incompatible with its other charges) the Ordinary has the right to repudiate it.

3. The objects or the money which represent the foundation must, as soon as possible, be deposited in a secure place, designated by the Ordinary. After consultation between the parties interested and the diocesan council of administration, these goods will be the object of careful and profitable investment, carried out according to the directions of the Ordinary, and calculated to safeguard as much as possible the interests of the foundation (c. 1547). It is not forbidden to invest the money in securities, (stocks or bonds), provided they are the securities of sound and reputable companies.

It follows from this that there is no real foundation of Masses when the church receives, not the goods themselves, but only the revenue from them paid out each year by the heirs of the donator. In this case, the rector will take care to insure by all possible means, the fulfillment of this pious intention; but the Masses thus requested are only *manual* Masses and not in any way foundation Masses.

4:—Finally, the agreement of foundation must be drawn up in writing; this agreement must set forth all the circumstances specified by the donator and accepted by the Church, like the date and the place of the celebration of the Masses, their quality, etc.

76. All that we have just said (n. 44, 56, 64) on the subject of the obligation of celebrating manual Masses, and on the special circumstances of their celebration, apply also to foundation Masses.

The *Codex* directs that in every church there shall be a list of the foundation Masses together with all necessary information. This list shall be put in a safe place, and kept by the rector. Moreover, besides the ordinary register of manual Masses, (n.59), there

105. In cases where the founder has paid in a sum insufficient for a determined number of Masses, he should be notified, and the matter should be adjusted with him; if the founder is dead, the heirs cannot lessen the number of Masses asked for, and recourse must be had to the Holy See to secure a reduction, unless the founder has conceded this right to the Ordinary.

must be in every parish a register kept by the rector, containing an account of all the perpetual or temporary charges pertaining to foundations of Masses, as well as a list of their stipends; and on this list entry shall be made of the celebration of these Masses (c.1549).

Every year, the rector must give an account of the fulfillment of these obligations; every contrary custom is condemned (c. 1525, No. 1).

77. The duty of celebrating foundation Masses is not subject to prescription (c. 1509, No. 5); no custom, even one that is centenary or immemorial, can justify a change in the number, the place, or the quality of these Masses.

On the other hand, it is evident that, in the case of a temporary foundation, all obligation ceases at the expiration of the time specified by the founder. In like manner, if the sum paid for the celebration of the Masses perishes without any fault of the administrators,[106] the obligation is annulled; for the obligation arises from the receipt of the stipend and disappears with it.

The same solution applies when the funds on which the foundation is based, fail to bring in any revenue, no matter what may be the cause; the obligation is *suspended* so long as the revenue is not forthcoming. If these funds perish in part, the number of Masses to be celebrated is diminished in equal proportion, at least in the case where the founder specified a stipend for each Mass. If he simply specified the number of Masses, without fixing the stipend, the Holy See alone could reduce the number of Masses[107] (c. 1517).

Article V. The Reduction and the Condonation of Foundation Masses

78. Reduction of foundation Masses is an act of competent authority which, for a just and grave reason, diminishes the number of Masses specified by a founder, or by him who has given manual stipends. It looks to the future, therefore.

---

106. If the loss of the funds is attributable to bad and *culpable* administration, the administrator shall be responsible.

107. It is wise, therefore, to stipulate, in the foundation contract, the stipend for each Mass, or to obtain from the founder permission for the Ordinary to reduce the number of Masses if the revenues diminish or if the regular Mass-stipend is increased.

Condonation, on the contrary, is an absolution for the past. It relieves a priest (before God and before the Church) of the obligation of saying Masses for which he was responsible and which he failed to celebrate.

79. These two acts are *exclusively reserved to the Holy See.* However, if the founders give their consent, the Ordinary can reduce the number of Masses.

Again, it is to the Holy See that recourse must be had when the revenues of a foundation, because of circumstances, are not sufficient to pay the necessary charges. In cases of this kind, the Ordinary has the power to reduce the foundations pertaining to various pious works, but the *Codex* formally excepts foundations of Masses, whose reduction is reserved to the Sovereign Pontiff (c. 1517, No. 2). The Pope, in reducing the number of Masses, can supply the deficiency by applying to the dead the satisfactions in the treasury of the Church and the fruit of the prayers which the faithful offer up according to his intention;[108] but no one other than the Pope can do this.

80. However, Ordinaries can obtain from the Holy See indults which will authorize them to reduce foundation Masses, or even, in a general manner, all pious foundations. When the indult refers to foundations Masses only, the Ordinary cannot take this as authorization to proceed to the reduction of manual Masses or other pious foundations. When it is granted for *all pious foundations,* the Ordinary should, so far as possible, reduce the other foundations rather than the foundations of Masses (c. 1551, Nos. 2 and 3). When the founded Masses were solemn or sung Masses, the reduction should be made as to the solemnity rather than as to the number of the Masses.

81. The reduction and the condonation of Masses always suppose a just cause proportionate to the favor demanded. Such are, for example, for reduction: the poverty of the priests, the diminution of the revenues of the foundation, or the increase in the tariff of the stipends, or the special necessities of a community or a church, etc. The motives for condonation are less numerous; some of them are: the insufficiency of the revenues of a foundation to permit the celebration of numerous Masses omitted in the

108. It is plain, therefore, that the souls of the dead do not suffer any loss, either from the reduction or from the condonation of Masses. The same graces accrue to them, but in a different way.

past, impossibility or difficulty (infirmity, extreme poverty), in the case of a priest, of celebrating or having celebrated the omitted Masses. On several occasions the Congregation of the Council has declared that they are to be refused absolution who, in the perverse and shameful hope of obtaining condonation, have maliciously neglected to satisfy their Mass obligations.

When granting this favor, the Holy See always imposes a penance, which generally takes the form of the celebration of a certain number of Masses.

82. For the *forum internum,* it is the Penitentiary which grants these favors. For the *forum externum,* it is the Congregation of the Council, or, for missionary countries, the Congregation of the Propaganda, and, for the Oriental rites, the Congregation for the Affairs of the Oriental Church.

CHAPTER IV

The Dispositions Required of the Celebrant

83. To celebrate Mass, the priest must have certain dispositions of body and soul, and he must be assisted by a Mass-server; to celebrate in a strange church, he must be provided with a *celebret.*

Article I. Dispositions of Body

These are three in number: (1) Freedom from all irregularity; (2) the Eucharistic fast; (3) the wearing of the cassock and the liturgical vestments.

84. 1. Freedom from All Irregularity *Ex Defectu.* The *Codex* forbids all those to say Mass whom a bodily defect prevents from fulfilling this duty *in a sure and fitting manner.* But we must not forget that a defect which might prevent the reception of Sacred Orders is not necessarily enough to prevent the exercise of that Order when it has once been received (c. 984, No. 2). The law is more lenient with regard to the priest than with regard to the young man who desires to become a priest.

Amongst these defects may be reckoned: total or practically

total blindness, the amputation of the arms or legs, every sickness which would expose the celebrant to serious accidents, a repugnant ailment which would excite disgust in the congregation, or a physical deformity which would provoke ridicule, etc.[109]

85. 2. The Eucharistic Fast.—The law of the Eucharistic fast forbids the taking after midnight of any drink, food, or medicine before celebrating Mass (c. 808). This binds the priest who is to say Mass just as much as the faithful who are to receive Communion; we shall explain this in detail when we treat of Communion (n. 298). The priest who would dare to violate this law (apart from the exceptions given below) would be punished by suspension *(a Missae celebratione)* for a longer or shorter space of time fixed by the Ordinary according to the circumstances (c. 2321).

However, this rule is subject to exceptions. A priest may celebrate even though he is not fasting:

a. *In order to finish the sacrifice of the Mass,* first, when he adverts only *after* the consecration to the fact that he is not fasting; secondly, when he notices, at the moment of Communion, that he had put water into the chalice instead of wine (cf. n. 184, note); thirdly, when he is summoned to finish the Mass of a brother priest who is suddenly stricken with death or with a severe illness (cf. n. 238).

b. *To avoid personal disgrace* or the scandal of the faithful. Such would be the case of a priest who would remember that he is not fasting only when he is already at the altar, and who cannot retire without arousing the wonder and perhaps the serious suspicion of the congregation. Such also would be the case of a priest who, even though he is conscious of his state before going to the altar, yet cannot omit the celebration of the Holy Mass without provoking malicious comment.

---

109. The Ordinary has the right to decide whether a certain bodily defect prevents the *sure and proper* exercise of the Eucharistic ministry. With regard to priests wounded in the war the Holy See has given Ordinaries special indults; however, recourse must be had to Rome in cases where the celebrant needs an assistant priest, or is compelled to omit ceremonies of some importance.

In a general way, the doctrine of the *Codex* is less severe than the former legislation; the loss of an eye (right or left) is no longer, of itself, an irregularity, nor even the amputation of an arm (in the case of one who is already a priest), if an artificial arm permits him to perform properly the ceremonies of the Mass. In cases of undoubted irregularity, the Holy See today accords dispensations more readily than formerly; young men who have lost their right arms have received permission *to receive* Major Orders; and dispensations have been given even to the blind.

This might happen on an ordinary day,[110] or on a holy day or Sunday. The absence of a priest from the altar on a day of precept, however, would be more liable to provoke criticism. The course of action to be followed varies as the danger of disgrace is more or less serious, and hence it varies with the place and the persons concerned. In certain parishes a simple explanation of the facts would be enough to avoid all scandal; and in this case, the priest would not be justified in saying Mass merely for the purpose of not depriving the congregation of the privilege of assisting at Mass. Respect for the law of fasting would dispense them from this obligation. A priest is permitted to celebrate without being fasting, therefore, not simply when it is a question of enabling the faithful to obey the law of the Church, and *a fortiori*, not when it is a question of merely permitting them to satisfy their devotion, but only when it is a question of avoiding personal disgrace for himself.

c. *To escape death*, on condition, however, that the demands of those who threaten him are not dictated by contempt for religion or hatred of the Holy Eucharist.

d. *To give Communion to himself when in danger of death, or even to give the Viaticum to a dying person.* This last point, however, is not admitted by most theologians. Some maintain, however, and, it seems to us, with reason, that the observation of an ecclesiastical law by the priest should not stand in the way of the observance by the faithful of a law of divine origin.

Moreover, it is quite evident that the case can happen but seldom, and that the priest would not be justified in saying Mass under these conditions if he could otherwise procure a consecrated Host in good season.[111]

e. Finally, *by virtue of a dispensation* from the Holy See.

---

110. Theologians commonly hold that a young priest who has through inadvertence broken his fast may nevertheless say his first Mass if his abstention would arouse suspicions or criticisms embarrass or scandalize his family or the people.

However, in this case as in the others, it is understood that the faithful shall not know of the breaking of the fast if step on the priest has no right to say Mass.

111. If after having taken the ablutions, the priest notices on the paten or the external purificator of the consecrated Host, he may and should consume them, because they belong to the same sacrifice. He may, in this case, be dispensed from these principles only when he receives the Sacrament, and after having taken off the vestments.

If it is a question of a whole Host, or of a considerable fragment, he may likewise consume these consecrated species belonging to the same sacrifice, unless it would be easy to preserve them with all due respect until the next Mass (e.g. in the tabernacle, or on a corporal).

The same applies when, at the moment of Communion, the consecrated particle

86. Such dispensations can be given by the Holy Office (c. 247, No. 5). Hitherto they have been very rare and very much restricted; but as the lack of priests makes the discharge of the ministry very laborious in these days, especially in certain countries, the Holy See has deigned to relax its severity, either by according Ordinaries general powers or indults, or by granting dispensations directly to the priests who ask for them.[112]

However, it is to be remarked that these dispensations do not in any way modify the rigorous character of the Eucharistic fast, whose interpretation must remain in conformity with the common teaching of the doctors of moral theology and Canon Law. Now as before, no priest can give himself authority to disregard this law; and when he has obtained from competent authority a derogation in his favor, he must interpret it in the strict sense.

87. In the first place, this dispensation is granted only *for the spiritual welfare of the faithful,* never through a motive of devotion or personal utility of the celebrant. Moreover, the decree of the Holy Office and the tenor of the rescript place these conditions around the concession:

---

which is mixed with the Precious Blood adheres to the side of the chalice; it is then permitted to receive it with the ablution, and the priest is not to be disturbed if he takes the liquid before the host itself. Or one may, in this case, use one's finger to bring the particle to the brim of the chalice; but the former procedure is more fitting, and is recommended by St. Alphonsus de Liguori.

112. According to the letter *Optime novit* (March 22, 1922), dispensation from the Eucharistic fast can be granted in three different ways:

1:—In *grave* and *urgent* cases, the Bishop may give the dispensation himself, with the obligation of notifying the Holy See as soon as possible.

2:—In ordinary cases, where the priest finds himself in the circumstances determined by the letter *Optime novit*, he may ask the Holy Office for the dispensation; the Holy Office, if it judges the reasons to be sufficient, will answer by a personal concession.

3:—Finally, the Holy See grants to Bishops who ask for them, general faculties which allow them to give dispensations to such of their priests as find the Eucharistic fast a *grave and certain inconvenience;* but the Bishops in these cases must accept the responsibility for their acts (*graviter onerata eorum conscientia*).

However, these indults, (at least such of them as we are familiar with), do not include all the cases mentioned in the letter of Cardinal Merry del Val. They authorize the Bishops to grant dispensation *only in cases of bination;* and the only priests who can benefit by the dispensation are those who have *charge of souls,* and who say Mass, on *Sundays and Holidays of obligation, outside their parish church,* and in a distant place. (For more ample concessions recourse must be had directly to the Holy Office).

This indult is granted for three years, and supposes that the *particular circumstances* which have given rise to it remain unchanged. At the end of this period, the Bishop shall report to the Holy Office the number of dispensations he has granted and the reasons which have determined him to accord them.

It is plain from all this that, in the mind of the Holy See, this derogation from the law of fast must be only temporary: it is explained only by the lack of priests, and must disappear with the circumstances which motivated it (L'Ami du Clergé, *23*, 572).

1. It applies only to *Masses of bination* or *late Masses*[113] which the priest is obliged to say in order to enable his people to satisfy a precept of the Church. Late Masses during the week (marriage Masses and funeral Masses) are not included in the concession (at least, we know of no dispensations of this class, and we do not think there are any).

2. The permission is granted only if it is necessary to relieve the celebrant of a serious inconvenience. This inconvenience may result from the poor condition of his health, or from a ministry that is excessively laborious because of specially difficult circumstances of place or climate. But it is not the ministry in itself that is the motive of the dispensation; it is the particularly distressing fatigue that results from it to the priest.[114]

3. It is not permitted to take anything except *per modum potus.* Therefore no solid food, even medicine. Likewise the *absolute* exclusion of any drink which is capable of producing drunkenness (alcohol, wine, cider, beer, and every alcoholic liquid of whatever description). This condition is to be interpreted, moreover, in the same manner as for the faithful (n. 334, No. 4).

There is no limit set to the quantity of drink permitted; the word *aliquid* merely indicates that a moderate quantity is intended. Nor does the decree fix any interval of time between this *frustulum* and the Mass; out of respect for the Blessed Sacrament, it is *fitting* that some hours should intervene.[115]

Finally, it is the wish of the Church that all precautions should be taken to prevent the faithful from being scandalized. To this end, the rescripts of the Holy See forbid the disclosure of this permission, and prohibit the Ordinary from giving it in writing.[116]

---

113. More serious reasons are required to secure the dispensation when one says but one Mass a day.

114. In cases where, according to the opinion of a reputable physician, fasting would expose a priest to a specific disease, or would aggravate a delicate condition of health, or would bring about a relapse, or would produce crises of a chronic complaint; or even in cases where fasting would compel a priest to abstain from necessary or useful acts of the ministry later in the day, or would oblige him to neglect the duties of his state, or even acts of personal utility of real importance, there would be sufficient reason for asking for dispensation from the fast (L'Ami du Clergé, 1923, p. 758).

115. In case of binating, the priest who is dispensed from the Eucharistic fast, may, at the first Mass, consume the ablutions (Congr., of the Holy Office, May 2-3, 1923).

116. It is possible that certain rescripts may contain special concessions, demanded by particular circumstances.
The more regular and more speedy way to secure this dispensation is to ask it through one's Ordinary, stating to him the reasons for asking the favor.

88. 3. The Cassock and the Liturgical Vestments.—The celebrant must wear a suitable garment falling to his heels, and also all the vestments prescribed by the special rubrics of his rite (c. 811, No. 1).

The long cassock, therefore, is obligatory. It must be black for priests who have no privilege to wear a different color; and it must be clean and whole.

Moreover, the celebrant must be shod. He must wear suitable shoes, "such as the priests of his diocese habitually wear *in public,* and in good condition" (S. R. C., n. 3268). In spite of the contrary opinion of St. Alphonsus, slippers are not permitted; they are footwear which are exclusively for the privacy of one's chamber.

89. Most theologians say that the wig is forbidden. The *Codex* has nothing to say on this point; the prohibition was made for the purpose of banning a vain adornment of other times, unworthy of so august a ministry. Nowadays in many countries custom has modified this prohibition; and we may now say that there is no law which forbids, for reasons of health, the wearing of a modest wig, whose sole purpose is to take the place of vanished hair and to protect the scalp from the cold.

90. The celebrant must not wear the calotte (zuchetto) or the ring[117] (c. 811, No. 2). It would be a mortal sin to keep the zuchetto on during the whole of the Mass, a venial sin if it was taken off from the Canon to the Communion. A sudden and momentary illness would be sufficient reason to justify the putting on of the zuchetto at the beginning and at the end of the Mass.[118]

The Holy See grants indults on this point, but with the obligation, however, of removing the zuchetto during the reading of the Gospel, from the Preface to the Communion, during the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, during the functions of the solemn Mass, and in presence of the Bishop.

As regards the liturgical vestments, see n. 166.

---

117. Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots and Prelates *nullius,* have the right to wear the zuchetto (red, violet, black, or white, according to the color of the robe) during the celebration of Mass.

Those who have the right to wear a ring (v.g., doctors, certain Canons, etc.) have no right, for all that, to wear it during the sacred functions (c. 1378). This privilege is reserved to Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots and Prelates *nullius,* Administrators Apostolic, Vicars and Prefects-Apostolic, regular Abbots, Protonotaries (except titular Protonotaries, that is, Vicars General or Vicars Capitular). Other priests may have this privilege by special concession.

118. St. Alphonsus considers it probable that, if there were no one present, or if those present knew the reasonable motive for doing this, the celebrant may habitually put on the zuchetto at the beginning and at the end of the Mass.

Article II. Dispositions of the Soul

91. 1. The celebrant must be *free from all censure,* irregularity, canonical punishment or impediment from the exercise of the sacerdotal order. Any one, therefore, who is attainted by any of these impediments, has a grave obligation to have recourse to his lawful superior and secure dispensation or absolution before celebrating Mass.[119]

92. 2. The celebrant must be *in the state of grace.* The obligation is the same for the priest who says Mass as for the laic who receives Communion; we shall consider further on (n. 294) how the state of grace necessary for Communion is to be acquired. The *Codex* contains, however, a special prescription regarding the ministers of the Holy Sacrifice: "Any priest who is conscious of being in the state of mortal sin must not celebrate Holy Mass without previously having recourse to *sacramental confession,* no matter what his interior sentiments of repentance may be. If, in case of urgent necessity, and in the absence of any confessor, he is compelled to say Mass after making an act of perfect contrition, he *is bound to go to confession as soon as possible thereafter*" (c. 807).

This is the same precept as was laid down by the Council of Trent (sess. 13, c. 7 and 11). It applies only to those who have the *moral certainty* of having committed a mortal sin which has not yet been forgiven. This is not the case of one who involuntarily forgets to confess a mortal sin in his last confession, or who would have serious cause to think that he was not guilty of a mortal sin.[120]

---

119. We cannot state here all the rules concerning the dispensation from irregularities or the absolution from censures. We shall merely say that in *occult* and *urgent* cases, any confessor may dispense from irregularity arising from an occult crime *exceptis homicidio et abortu voluntariis.* He might even dispense from irregularity arising *ex abortu occulto,* but the penitent must have recourse to the Holy See within a month.

Likewise, *in urgent cases,* any confessor may absolve from censures *latae sententiae,* if necessary to avoid scandal or the disgrace of the penitent; but he must impose on the penitent the obligation of having recourse, within the space of a month, to the competent superior.

120. In cases of doubt, it is better to discourage scrupulous souls from going to confession, and to recommend confession, or even to impose it, on those who are rather lax. But for all who have any serious fear of not being in the state of grace, they should be urged at least to make an act of perfect contrition.

In the rubric of the Missal we read the following: *"si praecesserit pollutio nocturna quae causata fuerit a praecedenti cogitatione quae sit peccatum mortale, vel evenerit propter nimiam crapulam, abstinendum est a celebratione, nisi aliud confessario videatur."* It does not seem that there is any prohibition, properly so called, even *sub veniali,* when absolution has been received for this sin. In practice, one should follow the advice of his confessor.

93. From the tenor of this precept, it follows that, to justify himself in saying Mass without confession, a priest in the state of mortal sin must:

a. *Be in a case of urgent necessity.*—Such as the following cases: the necessity of consecrating to provide Viaticum for a dying person, a well-founded fear of disgrace or scandal,[121] the necessity of saying Mass so that the faithful may satisfy a precept of the Church, the impossibility of retiring from the altar when one recalls a mortal sin in the course of celebrating Mass or when one has the unspeakable misfortune to commit a mortal sin during the celebration of the Mass. In such a case, the only thing to do is to make an act of perfect contrition and go on with the Mass.

b. *Be without access to a confessor.* The mere absence of the usual confessor is not enough; it is necessary that there should be absolutely no confessor in the immediate vicinity of the priest and that the circumstances (time, age, health, distance,[122] press of work) make it impossible for him to go elsewhere to confession.

The celebrant would likewise be dispensed from confession if the priest to whom he finds it possible to betake himself, will not or cannot hear his confession, either because he does not know the language, or because he is an *excommunicatus vitandus,* or because he has no jurisdiction. He would be excused also if it was impossible for him to go to confession without disclosing at the same time the sin of a *complex,* or if he could not go to confession without serious inconvenience to himself, if he had *serious* reason to fear the indiscretion of the confessor, or if he felt an extraordinary and invincible repugnance to revealing his sins to him, for example, if it was a question of confessing a shameful sin to a near relative.[123]

---

121. Even on an ordinary day, the abstention of the priest, when he is known to be at home, might give rise to suspicion and provoke scandal.

122. Theologians commonly hold that the obligation ceases if the confessor is a league or a league and a half from the residence of the celebrant. And it must be reasonable to suppose that the trip could not easily be made by railroad or auto.

123. One should not too readily avail himself of this motive of the shame he would feel by making his confession to a certain priest; for the bad impression which the other would form does not of itself cancel the obligation, since that drawback is very much minimized by the obligation of secrecy. Only very special circumstances, (the condition of the penitent, intimacy with the confessor, etc.), can give this motive any special importance and dispense the priest from making his confession. . . We must admit, however, that there is at times more force to this motive than in the necessity of making a trip of several kilometers.

In cases of this kind, any priest may absolve from reserved cases. This, therefore, cannot be a reason for not going to confession.

c. *Make an act of perfect contrition.*—The *Codex* adverts to this obligation; and the nature of the Eucharist, instituted to *develop* supernatural life, sufficiently shows its necessity. We must not, moreover, exaggerate the difficulties of the act of charity. He who, deprived of the helps which he finds in the tribunal of Penance, sincerely renounces sin, with the intention of going to confession as soon as possible, as the Church commands, may consider that he is in the state of grace when he finds himself in a case of necessity.

94. When a priest is obliged to say Mass under the conditions just explained, the Church, as we have seen, imposes on him another obligation, namely, to go to confession *as soon as possible.* This obligation applies only to the priest who says Mass; it does not apply to a laic (or even to a priest) who, under the same circumstances, receives Communion without confession, because of reasons of urgent necessity.

The words "as soon as possible" mean *within two or three days.* This does not mean, of course, that the priest can, during these three days, continue to say Mass without bothering to go to confession. He may do this only, if, during that time, the two justifying conditions are repeated, namely, the necessity of saying Mass and the absence of a confessor.

This is a matter not merely of counsel, but of precept, and of grave precept; but it is binding, in all certainty, only on those who go to the altar with the consciousness of mortal sin. It is probable that the precept does not bind one who remembers his mortal sin only after the consecration, or even after having commenced Mass. We have already remarked that it does not bind one who says Mass after a confession in which he has *involuntarily* forgotten a mortal sin.[124]

95. 3. *Proximate Preparation.*—Besides this preparation which is necessary to put himself in the state of grace, the priest is required by the rubric of the Missal, before commencing Mass, to "recite at least Matins and Lauds, and to devote a certain amount of time to prayer" *(De defectibus, No. 10; Ritus servandus, No. 1).*—It also recommends the recitation of special prayers *"pro*

124. Nor does this precept bind, according to most theologians, the priest who is guilty of mortal sin, who does not hesitate to say Mass sacrilegiously, either because he needlessly avoids going to confession or because he says Mass without necessity. For such a one, they say, such a law cannot be anything but harmful, for he who violates a divine precept would show still less respect for an ecclesiastical precept.

sacerdotis opportunitate."—This is not, therefore, a matter of precept, any more than for the recitation of Matins and Lauds.[125]

96. The *Codex* reminds the priest "that he must not neglect to prepare himself, by pious prayers, for the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, nor to give thanks to God for so great a blessing after the celebration of the Mass." (c. 810). These prayers are left to the choice of the celebrant who would do well, however, to use those of the Missal. It is fitting, says St. Alphonsus, that we should not content ourselves with the recitation of a few formulas taken from a prayer book, but that we should devote a certain space of time (half an hour, or at least a quarter of an hour) to mental prayer.

For thanksgiving after Mass, the rubric indicates the canticle *Benedicite* and the psalm *Laudate,* followed by some versicles and three prayers. Other prayers are then proposed *"pro opportunitate sacerdotis."* Are we to conclude from this that the first prayers are obligatory, at least from the date of the publication of the new Roman Missal? Some authors say Yes, because of the difference in the manner of indicating them, for the first prayers are set forth under the simple heading *"Gratiarum actio post Missam."*

Other authorities say that there is no sin in omitting them.

All, however, agree in saying that more importance is to be placed on the thanksgiving after Mass than on the preparation before Mass. And we must admit that, unless there is an excusing cause, it would be a venial sin to celebrate Mass without any preparation or thanksgiving.[126]

---

125. This seems to be well established. Nevertheless, many authors say that it would be a venial sin to omit without reason the recitation of Matins and Lauds before Mass; they admit, however, that a legitimate reason of any kind excuses from all sin (Lehmkuhl, 301).

126. Our confreres will thank us for recommending to them some of the resolutions of St. Leonard of Port Mauritius:

"I shall prepare myself for saying Mass with extreme care. To this end, I shall go to confession twice a day, when this is possible. . . so as to bring to the altar the greatest purity of heart and to increase grace within me.

If I have time, I shall recite the psalms proposed by the Church; if I have not, I shall supply the deficiency by interior acts.

I shall never say Holy Mass without wearing a hairshirt.

I shall be very exact in all the ceremonies, the rubrics, the signs of the cross, the genuflexions, without omitting any detail; I shall observe the greatest possible external modesty, true internal recollection, paying heed to the meaning of the words, offering up the divine Sacrifice for the four principal ends for which it is instituted... I shall make this offering at the *Memento.*

At the moment of the consecration, I shall form an actual intention...; in the act of Communion, I shall excite in my heart lively acts of faith, love, contrition, and desire of transforming myself completely into Jesus.

Article III.—The Server of the Mass

97. The celebrant must be assisted by a minister whose role is to serve him and to answer the prayers[127] (c. 813, No. 1).

This is a grave law. To say Mass without a server or one to answer the prayers, an apostolic indult or a *case of necessity* is required. For example, the obligation of celebrating to provide Viaticum for a dying person, or to enable the faithful (or even only the priest himself) to satisfy the precept of assisting at Mass, the obligation of not interrupting the sacrifice if, during the course of the celebration (even before the Offertory) the server leaves the church.[128]

98. The office of server of the Mass cannot be discharged by a woman. According to all theologians, it would be a mortal sin for a woman (even though a religious) to *serve at the altar.* In such a case it would be better to celebrate without a server.

It would be only a venial sin if the woman merely answered from her place, without entering the sanctuary. *If no server is available,* when there is a reasonable cause, (a *grave* cause is not required), the *Codex* declares that a woman may answer the priest provided that she does not approach the altar under any pretext (c. 813, No. 2). A simple motive of devotion will suffice, especially when it is a religious who is answering the prayers of the Mass in the chapel of her community. For better than the ordinary laywoman the religious can worthily discharge this office; and because of the place, there is less reason to fear the astonish-

---

After Mass, I shall make a thanksgiving, according to custom...I shall likewise make the acts between nightfall and the Mass of the morrow, to prepare myself for celebrating so august a sacrifice; having always in mind that the best means for preparation and thanksgiving is to have a pure and humble heart, a heart illuminated by a lively faith, I shall make many acts of interior humility, of oblation, of praise, of love, and of contrition.

I shall form the intention and the desire to hear all the Masses that shall be said this day thruout the whole world." (Annals of the Priests-Adorers, 1924, p. 315).

127. The server is to change the Missal from one side to the other, to present the cruets, to ring the bell, and to answer with devotion and attention. But at private Masses, he must not, even if he is a priest, open the Missal, pour the water in the chalice or wipe the chalice after the ablutions. It is better also if he leaves to the celebrant the task of preparing the chalice in the sacristy. It would be an abuse for one server to serve two Masses at the same time.

128. In the absence of a server, the celebrant himself should fulfill the office. He recites the *Confiteor* only once; at the *Misereatur* he says *nostri* instead of *vestri,* and at the *Suscipiat,* he says *de manibus meis* instead of *de manibus vestris.*

It is the common teaching of theologians that a priest is bound to abstain from saying Mass *on account of devotion,* rather than to say it without a server or respondant. But he may, if necessary, content himself with the services of a man who cannot answer the prayers of the Mass at all, and who has to be directed by signs to do the rest.

ment of the faithful. Therefore any *serious difficulty* in getting altarboys justifies this very prevalent custom (S. R. C., 4015, VI).

99. When the Mass is a *strictly private* Mass, that is, neither conventual nor parochial, and without solemnity, there must be *only one server.* Only Bishops and Cardinals are allowed to have more than one.

On the other hand, when the celebration of the Mass is attended with some solemnity, it is not forbidden to have two servers; this applies to parish Masses with a numerous attendance, and also to community Masses.

At sung Masses (without deacon and subdeacon), it is allowed to have more than one server. There may even be a minister whose duty it is to open the Missal, uncover the chalice, pour the wine and water into the chalice, and wipe the chalice (provided, however, that this minister is in sacred orders).

100. The Assistant Priest.—At the solemn Mass, the Bishop has an assistant priest *wearing a cope.* But (unless by a custom that is immemorial) Canons have not this privilege, even when they celebrate Mass in the stead of the Bishop who is prevented from doing so himself. At the first *solemn* Mass of a newly ordained priest, the presence of an assistant priest is tolerated.

At every solemn or sung Mass, it is permitted to have an assistant priest stationed at the book, *wearing a surplice.* Even at a private Mass, Bishops and Protonotaries (participating or supernumerary[129]) may exercise this privilege, which is also permitted at the first *private* Masses of a newly ordained priest. In this latter case, the custom is in many dioceses, for the assistant priest to wear a stole, either from the beginning to the end of the Mass, or from the Canon to the Communion. This custom may be retained (S. R. C., n. 3515), although the liturgy does not prescribe the wearing of the stole unless the assistant priest is to touch the sacred vessels when they contain the Sacred Species.

Article IV.—The Celebret

101. When a strange priest presents himself in a church, armed with an authentic and valid[130] *celebret* from his Ordinary, that is,

---

129. Protonotaries *ad instar* also have this privilege; but outside of Rome they can exercise it only with the special permission of the Ordinary.

130. A *Celebret* is not valid if the time for which it was granted has elapsed, or if it contains a condition which has not been realized.

from the Bishop, Vicar-General, Vicar Capitular, or Administrator Apostolic if it is a question of one of the diocesan clergy, or from his major Superior if it is a question of a religious, or from the Congregation for the Oriental Church if it is a question of a priest of the Oriental rite, the rector of the church is *obliged* to permit him to celebrate Mass, unless there is a moral certain that, since the concession of the *celebret,* the stranger has been guilty of a *crime* which makes him unworthy to celebrate Mass (c. 804, No. 1).

102. This obligation entails likewise the obligation of furnishing the visitor with the vestments and the matter for the sacrifice. For the Church desires that her ministers shall celebrate as often as possible, and she cannot require them to carry with them all the things necessary for that purpose, when it is so easy to have them in all churches. Therefore she makes it a duty for the rectors of churches to render this service to their travelling brethren.[131]

But this obligation does not hold regarding a priest who would continue to come, for a long time and habitually, to say Mass in the same church. The *Codex* does indeed say that he must be admitted; but not that he must be furnished with the things needed for the Holy Sacrifice. Unless a custom exists to the contrary, the pastor is not obliged to furnish these, and the Bishop can do no more than advise him to perform this laudable act of charity.

103. When a strange priest has no *celebret,* the rector of the church *is not obliged* to permit him to say Mass. He may, however, permit him to do so, provided he has no reason to suspect the stranger's reputation. Even when it is a question of a total stranger, it is not forbidden (and in general it is proper),[132] to permit him to say Mass once or twice, provided he is wearing ecclesiastical garb, that he receive no emolument of whatever nature from the church where he says Mass, and that he write down in a special register his name, his office, and the name of his diocese[133] (c. 804, No. 2).

The Ordinary may make special rules governing these cases,

131. When the church is poor, and a priest asks to say Mass for his own accommodation, the Bishop can authorize the pastor to demand a moderate sum to cover the expenses entailed by the celebration of Mass.

132. There may be many reasons which will prevent a travelling priest from being able to present, on the very day of his arrival, the *Celebret* which he claims to have secured from his Bishop.

133. In the chapel of a community of nuns, it is the chaplain, and not the Superioress, who gives permission to say Mass.

provided that he respects the prescriptions of the *Codex*.[134] These rules will be binding on all the priests of the diocese, even the exempt religious, unless it is a question for these latter, of giving permission to religious of their own Order to celebrate in their church (c. 804, No. 3).

CHAPTER V

The Time for Saying Mass

Three questions are to be taken up in this chapter. (1) The days on which Mass is permitted; (2) The number of Masses permitted on a single day; (3) The hour for saying Mass.

Article I.—The Days for Saying Mass

104. According to the present-day discipline[135] of the Church, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass can be offered up on all days, with the exceptions peculiar to each individual rite (c. 820).

In the Roman rite,[136] the only day on which the saying of Mass is absolutely forbidden is Good Friday; the Mass of the Presanctified is not a sacrifice, since there is no consecration. And even on Good Friday, (and therefore with much more reason on Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday), it would be permitted to say Mass to provide Viaticum for a dying person if, through extraordinary occurrences, consecrated hosts had not been preserved.

However, on Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday, the following restrictions must be observed:

105. ON HOLY THURSDAY, strictly *private* Masses are

---

134. The prescriptions of the Ordinary would be null and void if they conflicted with the concessions of the *Codex;* they cannot, therefore, forbid pastors to give permission to say Mass to priests who are well known to them but who have no *Celebret,* or even, as some authors hold (Cappello, 737), to those whose *Celebret* has not received the *visa* of the Ordinary. They may, however, require that all the priests who say Mass shall write their names and addresses in a Register.

135. In the early ages of the Church, there was but one day designated for the celebration of Mass (liturgical day), namely Sunday; in the times of the Apostles, Wednesday and Friday were added; afterwards, especially in the Orient, Saturday. About the end of the 4th century, in many places, Mass was being said every day.

136. In the Ambrosian rite, the saying of Mass is forbidden every Friday during Lent, except (by special concessions) on the feasts of St. Joseph and the Annunciation, when they fall on Friday.

In the Oriental Churches, during Lent, Mass is said only on Saturday and Sunday and the feast of the Annunciation. On the other days, the liturgy allows only the Mass of the Presanctified. But in certain churches, this rule is not absolute.

forbidden, except for Cardinals and Bishops (even merely titular bishops), if they are not taking part in any solemn function. Most authors hold that this prohibition binds under pain of mortal sin.

In Cathedrals, in collegial churches and in churches which are bound to the conventual Mass, that Mass is the only one permitted. In the churches of Regulars, it would be permitted, in case of impossibility, to replace the conventual Mass by a low Mass, if the doors of the church were kept closed.

Moreover, if a holyday of obligation were to fall on Holy Thursday (v.g., the feast of St. Joseph in France, or the particular feast of the diocese), the Bishop should then see that before the solemn Mass enough other Masses are celebrated to enable the faithful to satisfy the precept. In this case, the Mass of the Feria should be said with *Gloria* and *Credo.*

In other churches, (churches of religious men or women of simple vows, college chapels, chapels of confraternities, hospitals, etc.), which reserve the Blessed Sacrament (and in such only), it is permitted to celebrate a *solemn Mass,* provided that after it the ceremony of the Repository takes place, and the Mass of the Presanctified is celebrated the next day. If there are no ministers for the solemn Mass, an indult would be needed to perform the function. It is not permitted, therefore, (unless in the case of a legitimately established custom), to perform these functions in a community chapel, with only one cleric or altarboy.

NOTE.—It is probable also that the Bishop can give permission (even in a general way, when the solemn function is not carried out), to celebrate before the solemn Mass *a low Mass for the convenience of the sick,* either in parish churches, or in the chapels of pious houses. (In the churches of Regulars it is the Superior who gives this permission.) Certain authors deny this right to the Bishop, because the decree on which it is based has disappeared from the *Decreta Authentica* (Lehmkuhl, 288; Gennari, *Monit. Eccl.* XII, p. 33). This argument, however, is not peremptory. A legitimate custom dispenses even from asking permission from the Bishop.

106. ON HOLY SATURDAY the restrictions are still more severe.[137] All *private* Masses are forbidden in all churches or

137. In the discipline of the primitive Church, Holy Saturday was an *aliturgical* day. This is why on that day, we say by anticipation the first of the two Masses for Easter, the one which, in olden times, was said after midnight.

oratories; and this prohibition is more grave than for Holy Thursday. Mass for the Communion of the sick is certainly forbidden.[138]

However, in parish churches where the blessing of the baptismal fonts is to be performed this day, if, for any reason whatsoever it is impossible to sing the Mass, we believe that the pastor is allowed to say a low Mass, rather than omit the blessing of the fire, the candle, and the fonts. This permission would be incontestable if it was supported by a legitimate custom.

With the exception of this case, it is a solemn Mass that must be celebrated in cathedrals, collegial and conventual churches. In parish churches, it must be a solemn or sung Mass, as also in churches or oratories where all the sacred functions of the preceding days have been performed. However, the obligation to celebrate applies only to parish churches, where the blessing of the fonts is to take place.

Article II.—Plurality of Masses. Bination

107. The general rule, which binds *sub gravi,*[139] is that a priest can celebrate Mass only once in a single day[140] (c. 806, No. 1).

This rule, however, is subject to exceptions. Reputable authors admit that a priest may binate in order to provide Viaticum for a dying person, even if he is not fasting. Moreover, on Christmas Day, and on the feast of All Souls, all priests may (but are not in any wise obliged to) celebrate three Masses[141] (c. 806). On Christmas day the priest may apply three Masses to his intentions and accept a stipend for each of them. On the second of November, however, he may apply only one of the Masses to his intention; for the other two he is not allowed to accept any sti-

---

138. Even in cases where a holyday of obligation falls on Holy Saturday, the Bishop cannot permit the celebration of several Masses. The faithful who cannot assist at the ceremony of the day are therefore dispensed from the obligation of hearing Mass.

139. A priest who says more than one Mass a day without permission is to be punished by suspension *a celebratione Missae* for a space of time determined by the Ordinary (c. 2321).

140. It was not always so; Pope Alexander II was the first to prohibit the plurality of Masses.

141. For Christmas, the *Codex* consecrates a very ancient custom; and for All Souls Day it repeats the privilege which was first granted to Spain and Portugal by Benedict XIV and extended by Benedict XV to the whole world.
This privilege, whether for Christmas or for All Souls Day, does not apply to the priests of the Oriental rites.

pend,[142] and one of them must be said for all the faithful departed, the other for the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff.

This privilege applies equally to priests who enjoy the indult of a private oratory.

108. This privilege, as we have just said, has no binding force. The priest is free to celebrate one, two, or three Masses. On Christmas day, if any Mass is omitted, he must take from the Missal the Masses which correspond with the hours at which he says Mass[143]; if it is at midnight, he should take the first Mass; if it is early in the morning, the second; if later in the day, the third.

On the second of November, the first Mass is the one indicated in the Missal for the Commemoration of All the Faithful Departed; the second, the one for Anniversaries; the third, the *Missa Quotidiana;* the Sequence is said at each of these Masses, and only one oration is said in each. If the celebrant wishes to say but one Mass, he must take the Mass of the Commemoration of All the Faithful Departed.[144] This Mass is likewise the one that must be taken for the solemn or sung Mass; and in that case the priest may for the preceding two Masses, take the second and third.

109. For the ablution of the fingers after the first and the second Mass, the most practical and quickest method is to simply dip them in a vessel prepared beforehand containing a little water, like the one that is used after the Communion of the faithful before or after Mass.

---

142. May the celebrant, on All Souls Day, accept something for each of these two Masses, because of the supplementary labor (*ob titulum laboris extrinsici*)? No, say several authors (Augustine, c. 825; Ferreres, Compendium, II, 487; Vermeersch, Epitome, II, 78), because of a very explicit decision of the Congregation of the Council, Oct. 15, 1915. Others (Cappello, De sacramentis, I, 675), relying on canon 824, No. 2, hold that this prohibition no longer exists. A reply from the President of the Commission for the Interpretation of the Codex has confirmed this second opinion (A.A.S., 1924, p. 116).

143. Anyone who possesses an apostolic indult to say a Votive Mass, may say it three times.

On All Souls Day, he may likewise say three times the same Mass of the dead.

144. If he says only two Masses, he says the Mass for the Commemoration of all the Faithful Departed, and the Anniversary Mass.

The celebrant is perfectly free to choose the Mass for which he will accept the stipend, and to say Mass first for the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff, then for all the faithful departed, and finally for his own intention. But if he says only two Masses, one of which is for his own intention, the other must be for all the faithful departed.

The celebrant is not allowed to accept a stipend for each of the three Masses on All Souls Day, and to celebrate gratuitously on following days for the intentions prescribed for the Commemoration of the Dead.

As regards the prayers to be said at the foot of the altar, the priest recites them only when he leaves the altar, either after the first, the second, or the third Mass.

110. Bination.—Outside of these general permissions, others, more ample in extent, can be granted by the Holy See or by the Ordinary of the place. However, the Ordinary (Bishop, Vicar-General, Vicar Capitular, Apostolic Administrator, Abbot or Prelate *nullius*) cannot grant permission to binate except in cases where the lack of priests would prevent a notable portion[145] of the faithful from assisting at Mass on days of precept (c. 806, No. 2).

111. Two conditions are, therefore, required in order that the Ordinary may authorize bination: 1. that there is no other priest available to say the Mass; 2. that this permission has for its purpose, not merely the fostering of the piety of the faithful, but the enabling of them to fulfill a duty of obligation.[146]

It follows from this that binating (except in cases of special indult) cannot be permitted *by the Ordinary* on suppressed feasts, even when large numbers of the faithful come to the church. Nor can it be permitted for the convenience of an individual or a family, nor for the purpose of enabling members of a confraternity to have a special reunion or to gain indulgences, nor, with much greater reason, to increase the income of a poor priest.

On the other hand, binating may be permitted when the church is too small to accommodate all the fathful, when not all the faithful can (or even will) assist at one Mass, when the same priest is in charge of two parishes, or, in the same parish, of two churches too distant from each other to allow the faithful to worship in the same place. The privilege of binating may be granted not only for parish churches, but also for public or semi-public oratories; and as this privilege is given in the interests of the community, every priest, even though he be a stranger in the parish, may avail himself of it.[147]

---

145. We are to consider as *notabilis pars fidelium* a group of twenty or thirty people. By virtue of an immemorial custom, we may even do this for a lesser number.

146. In cases where there would be no necessity, but merely private or public utility, an apostolic indult would be required to authorize binating.

In like manner, the permission to binate ceases when a strange priest presents himself and agrees to say Mass at the time fixed for the convenience of the faithful.

The Holy See oftentimes grants more ample permissions, either in favor of pious communities, or even on ordinary days because of the concourse of the faithful at certain shrines.

147. On the other hand, the permission to binate, granted by apostolic indult, is a *personal* privilege, unless there is a special clause to the contrary in the rescript.

In cases of necessity, one may even presume the permission of the Ordinary, if it is impossible to have access to him. Thus, for instance, when in a parish a priest suddenly falls sick on a day of precept, his confrere can binate, provided that the interests of the faithful demand it, and provided that he is fasting.

112. On the other hand, it is not within the power of the Ordinary, even in cases of grave necessity, to permit a priest to say three Masses on the same day (c. 806, No. 2). Some reputable authors have maintained the contrary; but their opinion can no longer be looked upon as probable. Only the Holy See can grant this privilege; and it does on rare occasions grant it (v.g., during the war, and in ordinary times, to the clergy of Mexico).

113. Stipends for Masses of Bination.—When a priest secures permission to binate, he is not thereby allowed to accept a twofold stipend; one of the two Masses (the first or the second) must be gratuitous.[148] The Holy See does at times grant special indults in this matter; rarely it authorizes the celebrant (v.g., by reason of his extreme poverty) to accept a second stipend; but more often it permits him to accept a second stipend for the Mass of bination, *on the express condition* that he send it to the Ordinary, to help some diocesan institution designated in the indult. Moreover, by virtue of that indult, the Bishop can *compel his priests to celebrate the Mass of bination for a paid intention.* There is no room for doubt on this point, after the response given by the Congregation of the Council to the Bishop of Vigevano[149] (May 8, 1920). In this case, the celebrant must send to the Bishop the entire stipend, even if it exceeds the diocesan tariff, except when the surplus is in compensation for the labor entailed by the binating, or when the celebrant is *certain* that the giver of the stipend gives the surplus to him.

The celebrant cannot, therefore, accept two stipends; but by means of a Mass of bination he can satisfy an obligation of charity, an obligation resulting from a promise, a vow, or the command of a superior. He may in this manner discharge his obligations

148. Binating supposes a supplementary exertion which is often very considerable by reason of fatigue, the journey necessitated, etc. It is evident that, for this extrinsic exertion, the celebrant has a right to compensation, just as he has a right to be indemnified for the expense which the binating may occasion him.

149. According to this reply, the Bishop may impose a stipend for *all* Masses of bination. In most dioceses, a certain number of Masses (v. g. a fifth) are left to the free disposition of the binating priest, to enable him to satisfy his devotion or to discharge certain obligations of personal piety.

as member of an association whose statutes prescribe the celebration of one or more Masses for the dead.[150]

114. The Purification of the Chalice at Masses of Bination.—It is evident that the priest who is to say two Masses the same day cannot, at the first Mass, take the ablutions, unless he has received from the Holy See dispensation from the Eucharistic fast (Holy Office, May 2, 1923); otherwise, having broken his fast, he could no longer say another Mass (cf. the exceptions, n. 85).

In this case there are special rules for the purification of the chalice, varying according as the priest is to say the Masses *in different places* or *in the same church.*

115. In the former case, it is first of all recommended that the celebrant shall consume, with all possible care, all the Precious Blood at the moment of Communion. He then, with hands joined, recites the *Quod ore sumpsimus,* washes his fingers in the little vessel prepared for that purpose, covers the chalice as usual, but leaves it upon the unfolded corporal. Then he continues the Mass, without making any genuflections before the chalice. After the last Gospel, he returns to the middle of the altar, uncovers the chalice and consumes the few drops of the Precious Blood which may have gathered at the bottom of the cup. After this he pours into the chalice, (in quantity at least equal to the wine that was consecrated) a little *water;* he then tips the chalice from side to side, and causes the water to flow over all the portions of the cup which the Sacred Species had touched; after thus purifying the chalice, he pours the water into a vessel which has been prepared beforehand. All that then remains to be done is to wipe the chalice with a purificator and cover it as usual. The water which has served for the purification of the chalice may be poured into the *piscina,* or carried away by the celebrant and consumed at the second Mass, or kept until the next day and then consumed. At the second Mass the celebrant may use the same chalice or a different one.

150. A pastor who at the same time possesses a benefice to which is attached the obligation of saying Mass on Sundays for the founder, can (this is at least probable) on the Sundays when he binates, apply one Mass for his people and the other for the founder of his benefice.

Does the same hold good when the two obligations are not attached to the same day of bination? v. g., can a pastor, by the first Mass, discharge his obligation of the *Missa pro populo* which is attached to this day, and, by the second Mass, another obligation of the same nature which a *legitimate* impediment has compelled him to delay until this day? Most theologians condemn this manner of acting; others (Cappello, n. 735) say that it is probably legitimate. This last opinion seems to us to be difficult to accept because of the abuses to which it might easily give rise.

116. When the priest says two Masses *in the same church,* he proceeds exactly as above, but at the end of the first Mass, he does not purify the chalice. He may leave it on the altar; or, in case another priest is to celebrate before him, or he judges it prudent to do so, he may put it in the tabernacle, covered with purificator, paten, and pall; or he may remove it to the sacristy, provided that there it rests upon a corporal or pall and is shut up under lock and key in a fitting place. During the second Mass, the chalice must always stand on an unfolded corporal; at the Offertory the celebrant takes care not to put it down outside the corporal, and not to wipe it with the purificator; he will merely raise it up slightly above the corporal, gently pour in the wine and water so as to avoid making drops splash up on the sides of the cup, and make the oblation without wiping the interior, as is customary.

Article III.—The Hour for Saying Mass

117. It is not allowed to begin Mass earlier than one hour before the *aurora,* or later than one hour after midday[151] (c. 821, No. 1).

In se, this prescription is grave. Theologians generally teach that a priest would commit a mortal sin if, without a just motive, he finished his Mass two hours before the *aurora,* or began it at two o'clock in the afternoon. We believe that this infraction of the rule would be seriously grave only if it were habitual and frequent.

Moreover, a legitimate cause would excuse from all sin, provided that it were in proportion to the transgression. Let us enumerate amongst the principal of these causes: the providing of Viaticum for a dying person (in this case it would be permitted to celebrate at midnight); the wish to enable workers of any kind (laborers, clerks, servants) to assist at Mass two hours before the *aurora* or after noon; an extraordinary circumstance, such as a pilgrimage, public prayers, a marriage, a funeral; or merely a personal motive, v.g., a journey (on Sunday or on an ordinary weekday) which would prevent the priest from saying Mass unless he

151. Before the *Codex* the regular time extended from the aurora to noon. In the early ages. Mass was by preference celebrated at night; after the persecutions. public services were ordinarily held in the morning. and on fast-days, in the afternoon.

anticipated the usual hour.[152] The Holy See grants indults in this matter; but the Bishop has no power to give dispensations from this general law, except in particular cases where recourse to the Holy See is not possible (c. 81).

118. The *aurora* is that pale light which precedes the rising of the sun; it varies with the latitude of the country, and also with the season of the year. These variations are generally indicated in the Ordo of the diocese.[153]

In certain countries, the Netherlands, for instance, the *aurora,* at certain periods, lasts almost all night long; and then there is no reason why Mass should not be begun at *midnight,* although it would be more proper not to commence it until two o'clock in the morning; at other times it appears quite late or not at all (as in the polar regions in the wintertime), and in this case it is customary to take as the equivalent of the *aurora* the hour when the inhabitants are wont to resume their ordinary occupations.[154]

119. On Christmas day it is allowed to begin the conventual Mass or the parochial Mass at midnight[155]; but the *Codex* permits *only one Mass, sung or low.* In order to say the three ritual Masses, an apostolic indult is needed. The Sacred Congregation of Rites *(Decr. auth.,* n. 2520) has declared that the custom which permitted all priests to say three Masses during the night of Christmas was an abuse and it instructed the Ordinaries to do away with it. There are many dioceses which enjoy an indult in this matter,

---

152. More weighty reasons are required for celebrating Mass before the aurora than for celebrating after noon. It seems to us difficult to admit that one may, thru a simple motive of devotion, say Mass several hours before or after the prescribed time (v. g., two or three hours before the aurora).

For the celebration of the conventual Mass, there are special rules. It is usually said after the recitation of Tierce *in choro.* But on simple feasts and on ordinary ferias, it is said after Sext; on the ferias of Advent, of Lent and of the Ember Seasons, on vigils, and on All Souls Day, it is said after None. The Mass of Requiem is said after Prime; but funeral Masses and Requiem Masses for anniversaries, for the third, the seventh, and the thirtieth day, are said after None.

153. In France the aurora varies from about 5:30 in January to about 2:00 in June.

154. If there was a legitimate motive, the Bishop could determine the hour for Mass, except in churches which belong to exempt religious (c. 1171). This would be the case if the determination were necessary for the good of souls, to facilitate assistance at services, or to augment the piety of the faithful.

The Bishop may also complain to the Superior of a religious house whose services interfere with the instructions or homilies of the parish church; and it would be the duty of the Superior to remedy the situation (c. 609, No. 3).

155. The *conventual Mass* is the Mass, chanted or said, which, in cathedral or collegial churches or in the churches of regulars who are bound to recite the Breviary in choir, is celebrated daily in conformity with the canonical office. The community Mass which is celebrated in the chapel of a Congregation which recites only the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, has neither the character nor the privileges of a conventual Mass.

but generally such an indult authorizes only *one priest* to say the three Masses during the night.[156]

However, an exception is contemplated by the law in favor of religious or pious houses which have an oratory and which are entitled to habitually reserve the Holy Eucharist. In such an oratory *one* priest may, on Christmas night, say the *three Masses* of the feast, or only one of them, following the rubrics, especially as concerns the selection of the Mass; those who assist thereby satisfy the precept of the Church, and they may receive Communion at the Mass (c. 821, No. 3). This privilege, as is evident, is granted to *only one priest,* and even though he were to celebrate only one Mass, no other priest could follow him at the altar and say the other two Masses.

Moreover, this privilege does not apply to the *churches* of religious, destined to the use of the faithful; and this proves that even in semi-public chapels, the faithful cannot be admitted indiscriminately. However, if there is no oratory in the religious house, a priest may celebrate the three Masses of Christmas in the church itself, on condition that the doors of the church are kept locked, as is prescribed for the oratories.[157]

CHAPTER VI

The Place for Saying Mass

Regularly Mass must be said in a sacred place[158] (church or oratory), and upon a consecrated altar. This chapter will explain briefly the conditions which make the edifice and the altar fit for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice.

Article I.—The Church

120.—The church is a sacred edifice, intended primarily to enable *all the faithful* to assist at the public exercizes of divine wor-

156. Moreover, the Congregation of Rites has many times declared that it is not allowed to begin this Mass before midnight; and any contrary custom is an abuse.

157. Let us call attention to the privilege granted by a Brief of March 7, 1924 for the time and place where a Eucharistic Congress is held. "Wherever adoration is held during the night, it is allowed to say a Mass at midnight, and to give Communion at that Mass. The priests who take part in this adoration may say Mass in their turn after this Mass, beginning at one o'clock."

158. There are exceptions, as we shall see further on. In the early ages Mass was often celebrated outside of the sacred places, in the catacombs, in the camps, in the chambers of the sick, etc.

ship (c. 1161). In particular, the Mass (whether low Mass or sung) may always be celebrated in a church consecrated or blessed, and the Bishop cannot forbid this if once he has given his permission to build it.[159]

For the erection of a church, the *written* consent of the Bishop is required; the Vicar General cannot give this authorization unless he has received a special mandate (c. 1162).

Before divine worship is celebrated in it, the church must be consecrated or blessed. There is an obligation to solemnly consecrate cathedrals; likewise collegial, conventual, and parochial church must, so far as is possible, be consecrated.[160] But it is forbidden to consecrate a church that is built of wood, or iron, or of any other metal; such a church can only be blessed (and it should be blessed)[161] (c. 1165, No. 2).

121.—The Bishop of the place (provided he is already consecrated) has the right to consecrate[162] the churches and oratories of his diocese, even those belonging to exempt religious. If he has not yet been consecrated, he may delegate a bishop of the same rite.

The Vicar General, even though he possesses the episcopal character, needs a special mandate to perform this function (c. 1155).

It is also the Ordinary of the place who has the right to *bless* churches and oratories. However, the blessing of churches and

---

159. The Bishop has the right to place reasonable conditions on his authorization; but they will be null and void if they are contrary to the common law, for instance, the clause that assisting at Mass in a semi-public oratory does not satisfy the precept of the Church.

160. When a church is consecrated, unless an apostolic indult to the contrary has been secured, the high altar must be consecrated, or, if the high altar is already consecrated, another altar in the church must be consecrated. This condition is required only *ad liceitatem.*

161. A church built of reinforced concrete may be consecrated; however, the place for the twelve crosses and the frame of the main door must be of stone.

162. The feast of the consecration (or of the dedication) must be celebrated every year under the rite of a double of the first class with a common octave. Nevertheless, the Bishop may, on the day of the consecration, designate another day for this commemoration. In France this anniversary is celebrated on November 6th (rescript of January 14, 1914).

Moreover, every consecrated or blessed church has a titular (one of the divine persons, a mystery of Our Lord or of the Blessed Virgin, or the *saint* in whose honor the church is dedicated), and the feast is likewise celebrated under the rite of a double of the first class with an octave. The titular of the church must not be confused with the patron of the place. The feast of the titular is not *de praecepto,* and it is not allowed to transfer its solemnity to the following Sunday.

The feast of the titular is obligatory for all the ecclesiastics who are strictly attached to the service of a church; the feast of the titular of the cathedral must be celebrated by all the clergy of the diocese.

Once a church is consecrated, the titular cannot be changed save by apostolic indult; and the Holy See prefers to add another title rather than change the first. The Blessed cannot be titulars.

oratories which belong to exempt religious clerics is reserved to their major Superior. Both the Ordinary and the major Superior may delegate this power[163] (c. 1156).

The record of the ceremony is made out in duplicate; one copy is preserved in the diocesan archives, and the other in the archives of the parish (c. 1158).

122.—A church loses its consecration or its blessing only when it is totally destroyed, or when the *greater portion* of the walls is ruined, or again when it is "disaffected" and restored to profane uses by the Ordinary of the place (c. 1170). A disaffection proclaimed by the civil authority, or inaugurated by force by individuals, would not produce the execration of the church.

The consecration and the blessing, therefore, are attached to the walls. Consequently, if the church were destroyed and rebuilt on the same ground, out of the same materials, it must be consecrated or blessed anew. On the contrary, the consecration or the blessing persists even when the roof, or a considerable portion of the walls,[164] collapses; they likewise endure if an addition less important than the main building is erected, or if the whole interior finish cracks and falls. With much reason it is evident that the disappearance of the crosses does not affect the consecration (although the crosses must be repainted or replaced). Finally, the execration of the altar does not entail the execration of the church.

123.—It is likewise forbidden (and *in se* the prohibition is grave) to say Mass in a violated and unreconciled church.

The violation[165] of a church comes from the following causes: (1) a homicide (or suicide) that is voluntary and without legitimate excuse, even if there is no shedding of blood; (2) an *abundant* and gravely sinful shedding of blood;[166] (3) the performing of impious or sordid actions in the church (superstitious worship,

---

163. It is forbidden to make of the crypt of the church a cellar or a storehouse for profane objects. The same prohibition applies to a room that is over a church (c. 1164, No. 2); it is particularly forbidden to use such a room as a bedchamber.

164. If, on the contrary, the part demolished was more considerable than the part that remains, or if the part added is more important than the original portion, the consecration or the blessing must be repeated.

165. The violation of a church must not be confused with its execration. A violated church remains a sacred place, but it needs reconciliation.
It is plain, therefore, that a church which has not yet been blessed cannot be violated, any more than an oratory which has not received any blessing.

166. In order to produce a violation of the church, it is required (and it suffices) that the wound which is the cause of the shedding of the blood, must have been *received* within the church. Moreover, there would be no violation if the wound was due to an accident, or was inflicted in lawful self-defense.

pagan or heretical festivals, impure actions, capital executions, the transformation of the church into a stable, etc.); merely profane assemblages (political or commercial meetings) do not of themselves entail the violation of the sacred place; (4) the burial of an infidel or excommunicated person[167] (after sentence has been pronounced by an ecclesiastical judge); on the other hand, the burial of a heretic, a catechumen, of a child who was not baptized although born of baptized parents, or of a Catholic who is under interdict or suspension, does not violate the church.

It is to be remarked that these acts entail the violation of the church only when they are *certain, notorious* (that is, established by juridical proofs or performed in such circumstances that there cannot be any doubt about them), and *performed in the church itself*. If they took place in the sacristy, in the bell-tower, on the roof, in the crypt, the church would not be violated (c. 1172, Nos. 1 & 2). Remark also that the violation of the cemetery does not entail that of the church, nor the violation of the church that of the cemetery.

124.—A violated [168] church must be reconciled as soon as possible. In case of doubt, reconciliation is not obligatory, but it may be performed *ad cautelam*. (c. 1174).

If the church was merely blessed, it can be reconciled by the rector, or by any priest at all with the consent (at least presumed) of the rector. It suffices to use ordinary holy water; the formula is given in the Ritual.

If the church was consecrated, the reconciliation is reserved, as a general rule, to the Ordinary, or to the major Superior if it is a question of a church belonging to exempt religious clerics; and both the Ordinary and the Superior can delegate a simple priest. Nevertheless, in case of urgency and if recourse to the Ordinary is impossible, the rector of the church can proceed to reconcile the church, with the obligation of notifying the Ordinary afterwards. The rite is found in the Pontifical; the water must be blessed according to a special formula; but the priest delegated can give this blessing (c. 1176-1177).

---

167. In this case, it would be necessary, unless it were gravely inconvenient, to take away the body before reconciling the church (c. 1175).

168. In the case where the violation of the church is effected before the Canon or after the Communion, the priest must immediately interrupt the Mass; if it takes place during the Canon, he will continue until the Communion (c. 1173 No. 2).

Article II.—Oratories

125.—The difference between a church and an oratory arises from the fact that an oratory, although intended, like a church, for the exercizes of divine worship, has not for its direct purpose the enabling of *all* the faithful to fulfill their religious duties. It is intended particularly for the utility of a special portion of the Christian community.

Oratories are divided into public, semi-public, and private or domestic oratories.

126.—*Public oratories* are built especially for the use of a community, or even of a simple individual, but *all the faithful,* at least at the hour when the divine offices are held, *have the right,* recognized by the owner,[169] to enter.—*Semi-public oratories* are the property of a community or of a group of the faithful, and are not at the free disposal of the public. Such are ordinarily the oratories of colleges, religious communities, hospitals, prisons, etc.—A *private oratory* is one which is erected in a private house for the convenience of a person or a family (c. 1188).

The oratories of Cardinals and Bishops, although private oratories, enjoy all the rights and privileges of semi-public oratories (c. 1189).

Amongst private oratories must be classed the little chapels that are erected over the tombs of families or individuals; but the law concedes to them certain privileges (cf. n. 130, 131).

127.—*Public oratories* are subject to the same rules as churches, regarding their erection, consecration, and blessing,[170] the exclusion of all profane uses, privileges, and the exercize of the sacred functions.[171]

128.—As to *semi-public* oratories, the permission of the Ordinary is required for their erection.[172] Before giving such permis-

---

169. To obtain permission for a public oratory on his property, a private individual must pledge himself to permit free entrance to all the faithful forever. It is evident, however, that this right of the faithful does not prevent the ecclesiastical authority from closing the oratory if it sees fit to do so.

170. Many (Praelectiones de locis sacris, n. 72) says that the custom of not blessing public oratories, especially when they are unimportant, does not seem to be unlawful.

171. The rubrics forbid the solemn functions of Holy Week in oratories where the Blessed Sacrament is not kept. Parochial functions must likewise not be exercised in such oratories, v.g., the blessing of the font, the blessing of houses, public processions, etc.

172. This Ordinary is the Major Superior when it is a question of an oratory for the use of exempt religious clerics. To restore that oratory to profane uses it is necessary to secure the authorization of the Ordinary who gave the permission to erect it.

sion, the Ordinary should visit, either personally or by a delegated priest, the place selected and see that it is fit for the purpose and provided with all that is necessary.

Semi-public oratories may be consecrated or solemnly blessed. But this is not required; in fact, it would be better not to do so if the religious affectation of the place is only provisory. Indeed, it is not even necessary to give them an ordinary blessing in order to be permitted to say Mass in them; but it is more fitting, of course, to do this. All that the law demands is that these oratories shall be properly decorated, shall be reserved for divine worship, and shall not be used for any domestic purposes (c. 1196, No. 2).

In particular, care must be taken that there shall be no bedroom *immediately* above the oratory; the prohibition is formal if the Blessed Sacrament is to be kept in it[173] (S. R. C., Jan. 24, 1908). But it is not forbidden to have a bedroom beneath the chapel or in the rooms to one side; nor is it forbidden to have a workroom immediately above the oratory.

If these oratories have been consecrated or solemnly blessed, they must be reconciled in the same manner as churches, if they have been violated (n. 124).

129.—For the erection of a private oratory so that one may say Mass or have Mass said in it, an indult from the Holy See is required.[174] This is given nowadays by the Congregation of the Sacraments, at the recommendation of the Ordinary. It is the Ordinary, moreover, who is entrusted with the granting of this favor (*pro suo arbitrio et conscientia*), after having visited the

---

It is likewise that Ordinary who has the right, when necessity or serious utility demands it, to authorize one or more semi-public oratories in a house of education, or (it would seem with still greater reason) in a religious house.

In granting the permission to erect a semi-public oratory, the Ordinary is not forbidden to make certain restrictions, for example, to forbid the celebration of Mass on certain of the more solemn feasts.

173. A very special permission from the Holy See is required to deviate from this rule; and in such cases the indult ordinarily demands that there be over the chapel a double floor, or a baldachino over the altar.

174. A Brief of Feb. 20, 1924 grants the indult of the private oratory to all priests who are members of the Council General of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, not excepting even the feast of Easter. In case of a sickness which lasts more than fifteen days, this privilege is granted also, *de consensu Ordinarii*, to priests who are members of National Councils, to Diocesan Directors, and to priests who are members of the Diocesan Committee of the Society. The server and the person who is taking care of the sick man satisfy the precept of the Church.

Bishops ordinarily secure indults permitting them to grant the privilege of the private oratory to their *aged, infirm, or poor priests.* They must first visit the place and make certain that the oratory will not be used for any other purpose, that the apartment is suitable, and that the oratory is provided with all the things needed for the Holy Sacrifice (altarstone, chalice, altar furniture, linens and vestments). It is not necessary that no bedchamber be over the oratory.

place, or sent someone else to visit it, to make sure that all is proper and fit for divine worship.

The privilege of the private oratory is not attached to a place; it is *personal,* and the possessor of the indult may utilize it successively in his various domiciles. But the authorization of the Ordinary is necessary in each case. This privilege expires with the death of the person to whom it is granted.

The private oratory must not be either consecrated or solemnly blessed (c. 1196). It is allowed to give it an ordinary blessing.

The indult may contain more or less ample concessions. Ordinarily it allows only one low Mass each day, with the exclusion of the principal feasts[175] (c. 1195, No. 1). It is allowed to give Communion to those present; but it is not allowed to perform any other sacred function, or anything that may pertain to the parochial service of the place.

130.—Nevertheless the *Codex* grants to the Ordinary of the place (Bishop, Vicar General, Vicar Capitular) certain powers concerning private oratories.

In cemetery chapels (n. 126) it gives permission to authorize, even habitually, the celebration of one or more Masses. In domestic oratories (even when no indult has been obtained from the Holy See) the Ordinary can, in extraordinary cases and if there is a just and reasonable motive, authorize the celebration of *one* Mass, but only *per modum actus* (c. 1194), that is, for a space of eight or ten days. It is not forbidden to renew this permission, but if it becomes evident that the circumstances which have motivated it are going to continue, recourse must be had to the Holy See. Even for those days on which the indult forbids the celebration of Mass, the Ordinary can authorize, always *per modum actus,* the celebration of Mass if there are serious reasons, differing from those which have already been exposed to the Holy See (c. 1195, No. 2).

131.—The faithful who assist at Mass in a semi-public oratory, or in a cemetery chapel, or in the private chapel of a cardinal or a bishop, satisfy thereby the precept of the Church.

---

175. In France, according to Many, *De locis sacris, n. 88,* the reservation includes only the holydays of obligation of Christmas, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, The Assumption, and All Saints.

The indultarian must be present during the celebration of the Mass. An indult may be obtained for several persons, for several generations in the same family; in this latter case, the favor ceases only with the death of the last indultarian. The request may also be made to have the indult apply to every day in the year.

The expense of securing the indult, when it is granted to only one person, amounts to about 200 francs; it is more if special concessions are asked for.

The same does not hold good, however, for those who hear Mass in an ordinary private oratory, unless there be a special concession on the point from the Holy See (c. 1249). In this matter, one must abide by the terms of the indult in which are enumerated the persons who enjoy this privilege; it is quite easy to obtain the same favor for the relatives of the indultarian to the third degree, for his spouse's relatives (*affines*) to the second degree, for the persons whom he has received as guests in his house or invited to his table, and for his domestics.[176] The priest who celebrates the Mass satisfies the precept of the Church; so does the Mass-server who comes with him, provided that none of the indultarians can or will serve the Mass.

Remark that any person can receive Communion at a Mass that is said in a private oratory (c. 869).

Article III.—The Celebration of Mass in a Non-sacred Place

132.—When there is a just and reasonable cause, the Ordinary of the place (and, in exempt houses, the major Superior) can, in extraordinary cases and *per modum actus* (that is, during a short space of time), authorize the celebration of Mass outside the church or oratory (but never in a bedroom), provided that it is in a decent place and upon a consecrated altarstone (c. 822, No. 4).

For sufficient reasons, the Ordinary can also permit at times the celebration of Mass in the open air.[177] Amongst the reasons for asking this authorization may be enumerated: the necessities of war or of a time of pestilence, the destruction of the church, an extraordinary gathering of the faithful, a journey in a pagan country. It is enough if the utility of a group of Christians, or even of a single individual, be concerned.[178]

In a case of necessity (v. g., to enable the faithful[179] of a parish

176. Domestics, who are not mentioned in the indult, but whose presence about the indultarian is indispensable, are dispensed from the obligation of assisting at Mass, but do not satisfy the precept of the Church by their presence in the chapel.

177. A recent letter from the Prefect of the Congregation of the Sacraments to the Ordinaries of Italy (A.A.S., 1924, p. 370), reminds them that they cannot authorize the saying of Mass in the open air except in extraordinary cases and for a just and reasonable cause, and for motives that have reference to divine worship. The Bishop cannot give this permission on the occasion of profane feasts or civic holidays, nor, with still more reason, if this concession would be detrimental to the purity of faith or religion. If the petitioners insist, the Ordinary must refer the matter to the Congregation of the Sacraments.

178. It is also necessary, according to the Commission of the *Codex* (Oct. 16, 1919), that the extraordinary case foreseen by Canon 822 be realized in this case. The sickness of a priest or of a member of his household is not enough to justify the authorization, unless the sickness coincide with another event, for instance, an important anniversary.

179. This authorization cannot be presumed if the priest is saying Mass for himself alone, or for a small group of the faithful.

to assist at Mass on a day of precept), and if it is impossible to have recourse to the Ordinary, a priest may, on a Sunday or a day of obligation, presume such authorization and celebrate in a non-sacred place, provided that it is a decent and suitable place (cf. Privilege of the Portable Altar, n. 144).

133.—Amongst the places which are considered as not suitable for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, the *Codex* mentions in particular the temples of heretics and schismatics, even though they had formerly been regularly consecrated or blessed (c. 823, No. 1).

However, in certain countries the Church grants special authorizations; and even without an indult, in a case of real necessity, it would not be forbidden to say Mass in the temple of a heretical or schismatical sect.

134.—Finally, in order to say Mass *at sea,* an apostolic indult is required, even by those who enjoy the privilege of the portable altar (c. 822, No. 3). This permission is granted by the *Codex* to Cardinals and Bishops, and, by a Brief of Feb. 20, 1924, also to priests who are members of the General Council of the Propagation of the Faith.

The indult usually requires that the sea shall be calm, that there shall be no danger of spilling the Precious Blood, and, if necessary, that the celebrant shall be assisted by another priest.

Article IV.—The Altar

No. 1.—Concerning the Altar in General

135.—Even when a priest says Mass outside of a church, he must always (unless by a very exceptional concession from the Holy See) celebrate it upon an altar.

We must distinguish, *from the liturgical point of view,*[180] between the fixed and the portable or movable altar.

136.—The *fixed altar* is composed of a table of natural stone, not fragile (granite, marble, etc.), *in one piece,* supported by a base of stone, or at least by stone columns.[181] *The table and the*

180. In the vulgar sense of the words, we call an altar fixed when it cannot easily be moved from place to place, for instance, a block of wood in the middle of which a simple altarstone is placed, and which is not changed from one spot to another. It is in this vulgar sense that we say that the altar must be fixed in order to be privileged.

181. The chemical composition of the stone matters little; it is enough that it is hard, that it is not made up of pieces cemented together, and that it is of regular shape. The Congregation of Rites does not wish to have the table encased in a frame of marble or wood; its preference is for altars supported by full-sized bases, shut in on all sides; it does permit, however, skeleton bases, provided that the stone columns really support the table and are not a mere ornament.

base must form one structure, and they are consecrated together (c. 1198, Nos. 1 & 2).

137.—The *portable* or movable altar (generally referred to as the altarstone) is a simple stone (natural, hard, and in a single piece) large or small, square or rectangular. It must be large enough to accommodate the host and the greater part of the chalice. Ordinarily this altarstone is placed in a base of wood or stone, but the base is not consecrated.

138.—When a church is consecrated, it must have a fixed altar, preferably the high altar; in a church that is merely blessed, all the altars *may* be portable.

139.—Both the fixed and the portable altar should have, on the upper face[182] a *sepulchrum* or cavity hollowed out in front of the central cross; this *sepulchrum* must be sealed with a cover of *stone* (not wax or cement). It is to contain the relics of saints (c. 1198, No. 4), and in particular of some martyr.

It is not allowed to have altars composed of two distinct parts between which is hollowed out an excavation to contain the relics. The *sepulchrum* must be hollowed out of a solid block of stone.

140. Before being used for the Holy Sacrifice, the altar must be consecrated.[183] *Fixed altars* can be consecrated only by those who have the right to consecrate churches (n. 121); and it is *fitting* that this ceremony should take place on a Sunday or a day of precept. As regards *portable altars,* all Bishops, even merely titular Bishops, can consecrate them; so also can those to whom the law gives the right, (Cardinals, Abbots, and Prelates *nullius,* Vicars- and Prefects-Apostolic); and also those who have received an indult from the Holy See (c. 1199). But all who have not the episcopal character must make use of oils blessed by a Bishop.

The altar, whether fixed or portable, must be reserved for the celebration of the sacred mysteries, and cannot be used for any profane purpose.

It is particularly forbidden to bury corpses under the altar; the

---

182. When it is a question of a fixed altar, the *sepulchrum* may also be on the anterior face, beneath the table. As to altarstones in which the *sepulchrum* is not *in medio lapidis* but *in ejus fronte,* they are to be consecrated over again *breviori formula,* when this can easily be done *(cum commode fieri possit,* S.R.C., June 13, 1899). Therefore this regulation refers merely to the liceity of the consecration.

183. It would be a mortal sin to say Mass on a non-consecrated altar, or an execrated altar, or an interdicted altar (c. 2272). However, in case of very grave necessity (to provide Viaticum for a dying person), it would seem to be permissible to say Mass on a non-consecrated altar.

graves must be at a distance of at least a meter (about three feet) in all directions from the altar[184] (c. 1202).

141. This consecration of the altar, like that of a church, can be lost. The altar is then said to be execrated.

A fixed altar loses its consecration if the table of the altar becomes separated from the base, even for a short space of time, v.g., in transferring the altar from one place to another. In this case the Ordinary can delegate a simple priest to reconsecrate the altar; the Congregation of Rites has appointed, for this purpose (A. A. S., XII, p. 449), a special rite and a shorter form.

Both *fixed and portable altars* lose their consecration: (1)—when they suffer any considerable fracture, either considerable in itself (v.g., if none of the pieces is large enough to accommodate the host and the greater part of the chalice), or considerable because the fracture takes place in a spot where the anointings were made (that is, in the center of the altar, or in a corner where the cross is carved). In this case, it is not allowed to cement the pieces together and proceed to a reconsecration, for the stone would no longer be a single piece; (2)—when the relics are removed from the *sepulchrum*, or even when the cover of the *sepulchrum* is broken or lost. The Bishop, however, (or his delegate), can, without causing the execration of the altar, remove the cover of the *sepulchrum* in order to strengthen, repair, or change it, or even for the purpose of inspecting the relics.[185]

A slight fracture of the cover does not, as formerly, cause the execration of the altar; and any priest can repair this breakage with a little cement.[186]

Finally, the execration of the church does not entail the execration of the altars, whether fixed or portable, any more than the execration of an altar entails that of the church (c. 1200).

---

184. It is not forbidden to bury bodies in the floor of the crypt that is located under the altar.

According to the decrees of the Congregation of Rites, there would be no cause for concern if the distance of one meter were not observed with exactitude in burying a body near the altar, v.g., if it was buried about 95 centimeters from the altar.

In certain cases where the law had been violated, the Congregation commanded that the body should be taken up, *if it were not seriously inconvenient to do so (Decr. authent., n. 3399).* It is not forbidden to apply this broad interpretation to the prescriptions of the *Codex*.

185. The decree of the Congregation of Rites (Sept. 9, 1920) likewise contains a shorter formula for the reconsecration of altars that have been execrated; but the Ordinary must have an indult from the Holy See, in order to entrust this ceremony to a simple priest.

186. The episcopal seal is not required on the cover; and it is better not to put that seal on it.

142. Every altar *may* have a Titular. Every fixed altar *must* have its own special Titular. The Titular of the high altar should be the same as the Titular of the church; but a secondary one may also be given it. The Ordinary may change the Titular of a portable altar; but he cannot change that of a fixed altar.

Finally, special permission is required from the Holy See to dedicate an altar to one of the Beatified, even in churches or oratories which have been allowed the office and the Mass of the Beatified in question (c. 1201).

143. If there is no altar of his own rite available, a priest may celebrate on an altar of any other Catholic rite, provided that it is consecrated and that he says Mass according to his own rite. But it is always forbidden to priests of the Latin rite to say Mass on the *antimensia* of the Greeks (c. 823, No. 1). These *antimensia* are a species of corporal containing relics, which take the place of altarstones and receive the same consecration.[187]

It is likewise forbidden, except in case of an apostolic indult, to celebrate on a *Papal altar* (c. 823, No. 2). Such altars are the altar of the Confession of the great Roman Basilicas of Lateran, of St. Peter of the Vatican, of St. Paul's outside the walls, and of St. Mary Major.

No. 2.—The Privilege of the Portable Altar

144. This privilege confers the right to say Mass anywhere (except at sea), provided that it be in a decent place and on an altarstone (c. 822, No. 2).

It is required that the Blessed Sacrament be surrounded with all honor and respect, but it is not necessary that the place be free from all domestic use, nor that it be in the house belonging to him who enjoys this privilege. The *Codex* does not exclude the saying of Mass in the open air nor under the surface of the earth.

145. The law grants this favor to certain personages: Cardinals (c. 239, No. 1, n. 3); Bishops, whether residential or titular with the consent at least presumed of the Ordinary of the place (c. 349, No. 1, n. 1); Vicars- and Prefects-Apostolic (c. 294, No. 1, 308); Abbots and Prelates *nullius* (c. 323); Administrators Apostolic

187. In Greek churches there is only one altar, and only one Mass is celebrated each day; but there are around about the church, chapels or oratories where private Masses may be said. (Cf. altar furnishings, n. 17).

(c. 315); Protonotaries *participantes* (excluding Protonotaries supernumerary or *ad instar* or honorary); and finally, Auditors of the Rota.[188]

Besides the Mass which they say themselves, Cardinals and Bishops may permit a priest to say another Mass upon their portable altar; and any person who assists at either of these Masses satisfies the precept of the Church thereby, as occasion offers.

146. The privilege of the portable altar may also be secured by means of an apostolic indult. Missionaries very generally possess it, either by direct concession from the Holy See, or through the agency of Vicars Apostolic. Certain regular Orders, from whom this privilege had been withdrawn by the Council of Trent, have secured its restoration, with, however, restrictions in some cases.

The indultarians must abide strictly by the terms of the concession. *Ordinarily* only one Mass is permitted, but on great feast days no exception is made, as in indults for private oratories.[189]

No. 3.—The Privileged Altar

147. This is an altar on which a priest has the privilege[190] of gaining a plenary indulgence for the soul for whom he offers up the Holy Mass.

---

188. The Referendaries of the Signatura have not enjoyed this privilege since the time of the Council of Trent.

189. The privilege of the portable altar is sometimes granted to a lay person. It then permits the indultarian to have Mass said in his presence in a proper place of his selection. Unless the contrary is specially specified, only one Mass is permitted, and it must always be said in the presence of the indultarian.

190. The favor of the privileged altar refers particularly to the dead, and this is the favor that is generally conceded. *But* there are also privileged altars *for the living*, and even *privileged altars for both the living and the dead* (in this last case the indulgence can be gained for either a living or a dead person). For the living, the plenary indulgence is granted by way of jurisdiction, and for the dead, it is granted by way of suffrage.

Like the privilege for the dead, the privilege for the living can be either *local* or *personal*. Priests who are members of the Pious Union of the Death of St. Joseph, via Bernardo Telesio, Porta Trionfale, Roma, 48, have, by concession, from Benedict XV (June 15, 1917) renewed by Pius XI (June 29, 1923), the favor of the privileged altar every time they say Mass for *those who are in their agony*.

It is the common opinion that this indulgence can be applied only to the one dying person for whom the Mass is being said, or *to one of them*, if the fruits of the Sacrifice are being applied to several; it may, of course, be otherwise, and there have been occasions when the plural application of the indulgences has been granted by the Holy See, but this favor is an exception. (There is, however, a controversy concerning the interpretation to be given to the decree of the Holy Office (Nov. 9, 1922) which says that the priest "is not obliged to specify the one from amongst the dying to whom he applies the indulgence.")

This indulgence is of the same nature as the other plenary indulgences, but it has a more certain effect, because it is attached to the celebration of Mass and does not depend on the dispositions of the celebrant. It consists in this, that the Church, in granting this favor, disburses the sum of satisfactions necessary for the immediate freeing of a soul from Purgatory. This result, however, is not infallibly obtained; for God is free to accept or not accept these satisfactions, and we have no means of knowing in what measure he applies them to the soul in question.

148. In case the Mass is said for several dead persons, the priest must specify the one to which he wishes this indulgence to be applied.

It is not allowed to say Mass for one dead person and attribute to another the indulgence attached to the Mass.[191]

149. This privilege may be either *local* or *personal.* It is local when it is attached to an altar,[192] and in that case all priests who celebrate at that altar enjoy it; if it is personal, the priest who has received the privilege may dispose of the indulgence wherever he says Mass.

To gain the indulgence, it is not necessary that the celebrant (or he who gives the stipend) should have the intention of applying it. Any Mass said at a privileged altar is thereby privileged; the application of the indulgence depends on the dispositions of the soul for whom the Mass is celebrated.

In former times, in order to enjoy this privilege, it was necessary, when the rubrics permitted, to say a Requiem Mass. The Holy Office has recently declared that this is not obligatory, but is merely the fitting thing to do (Feb. 20, 1913).

This indulgence cannot be applied to a soul in Purgatory, and in cases where the Mass is said at one and the same time for both the living and the dead, the indulgence cannot be gained either for a living person or for a dead person. Finally, in cases where the Mass is said for several living persons, the priest (if we admit that the indulgence applies to only one person) must specify the one to whom he wishes to apply it. Nevertheless, if this is not done, the indulgence is not lost; it will be applied to one of the living persons, according to the will of God (Reply of the Holy Office, Nov. 9, 1922) (Cf. L'Ami du Clergé, 23, 629, & 24, 361).

191. It is forbidden to demand a higher stipend because of the privilege (c. 918, No. 2). This would be downright simony.

192. Unless a special concession has been obtained, this altar must be *fixed;* not, indeed, in the liturgical sense (n. 136), but in this sense that the altarstone must be placed in a support of wood or stone that is immovable.

The privileged is attached to the altar, that is, the external support, and not to the stone. The stone, therefore, may be changed without affecting the privilege. Indeed, the altar itself may be destroyed; and if, inside of 50 years, it is rebuilt under the same title, in the same spot, or even in another location in the same church, the privilege will revive with the altar.

150. The privilege, whether local or personal, may be granted in perpetuity or for a certain space of time (generally seven years). It may be for every day or for a certain number of days each week.[193]

When a priest possesses thru an indult the personal privilege for certain days each week, and possesses the same indult by virtue of his membership in a pious society, he may combine the two concessions. However, the same Mass, in spite of the twofold privilege, can gain only one indulgence.[194]

151. The *Codex* authorizes Bishops, Abbots and Prelates *nullius,* Vicars- and Prefects-Apostolic, and the major Superiors of exempt religious clerics (but not Vicars General nor Vicars Capitular), to designate and declare privileged for daily use and in perpetuity, one altar in their cathedrals, abbeys, colleges, convents, and parochial or quasi-parochial churches, which do not already enjoy this privilege. They have not the right to extend this same favor to public or semi-public oratories, unless they are united to a parochial church, or constitute succursal chapels of the parish (c. 916).

As an indication of this privilege, the inscription is to be placed on the altar: *Privileged altar, perpetual* (or *for .....years*), *daily* (or not), in accordance with the terms of concession (c. 918, No. 1).

152. On All Souls Day, all Masses are privileged (c. 917, No. 1), but the privilege is, as always, in favor of only one particular soul.

The same privilege exists in churches where the *regular* prayers of the Forty Hours are being held, during the days of the ceremony.[195]

No. 4.—The Gregorian Altar, and the Gregorian Masses

153. The exact nature of the privilege of the Gregorian Altar has been in times past the subject of many discussions by theologians. To put an end to these disputes, the Holy Office (Dec. 12,

193. Even in this case, the celebrant is not obliged, in order to gain the indulgence, to say Requiem Masses on free days.

194. This does not prevent the celebrant from gaining, *on other counts,* other indulgences for himself or for the dead.

195. The priest who makes the *Heroic Act* in favor of the Souls in Purgatory has the privilege of the personal and daily privileged altar.

1912) gave the following decisions: (1)—The Altar of St. Gregory, in the church of Mount Coelius, is a privileged altar (in the sense explained above);—(2)—The privilege known as "the Gregorian Altar" is no longer granted;[196]—(3)—As regards the personal concessions of the Gregorian Altar which have already been made, they are simply equivalent to a personal concession of the privileged altar.

154. The Gregorian Masses are a series of thirty Masses celebrated consecutively without interruption of days for the soul of one specified dead person.[197]

No indulgence is attached to the Gregorian Masses considered as such; the faithful who ask to have them said feel confident that these Masses either by the repetition of the expiatory power of the Holy Sacrifice, or thru the intercession of St. Gregory, have a special efficacy to secure the immediate deliverance of a soul from Purgatory. The Church does not condemn this belief, and the Congregation of Indulgences (March 11, 1884) has declared "pious and reasonable" this confidence of the faithful; but this, of course, does not justify the considering of the Gregorian Masses as an *infallible means of* freeing the soul.

155. The Gregorian Masses are ordinary Masses, without any special commemoration of St. Gregory. The Requiem Mass is not obligatory, but is fitting, on days when it is permitted. The special nature of the Gregorian series demands that the Masses shall be celebrated in thirty days, *without interruption and on thirty different days (one Mass each day),* whether by the same priest or by different priests.[198] However, during the last three days of Holy Week, the series may be interrupted provided that it is resumed on Easter Sunday.

156. Are there any other cases besides this, when a Gregorian series may be interrupted, without the obligation of beginning it all over?

196. This privilege consisted in attributing to an altar the same favors that were attributed to the altar of St. Gregory in the Church of Mount Coelius.

197. This is the way in which the name of St. Gregory became attached to this practice. At the death of one of his monks, who was named Justus, he requested another monk, named Pretiosus, to say for the dead man thirty Masses in succession. At the end of thirty days, Justus appeared to one of his brothers in religion and told him that he was delivered from the flames of Purgatory. "The religious," said St. Gregory, "remarked that this deliverance took place on the day when the thirtieth Mass was celebrated."—Such is the origin of the Gregorian Masses.

198. Therefore a priest cannot say more than one of the Gregorian Masses on the same day; nor can he, on Christmas day, say two or three Masses of the Gregorian series.

It is certain, as theologians tell us, that the special contract accepted by the priest obliges him to provide with great care for the continuity desired by the giver of the stipend; and any culpable negligence on his part would compel him to begin the series all over again in order to satisfy his obligations. But is this ruling applicable to *cases where the interruption is involuntary and innocent?* Suppose that a priest falls sick and cannot get any other priest to replace him; or suppose that he omits one Mass of the Gregorian series inadvertently at a time when the series is almost completed; what must he do in such cases?

There are reputable theologians who teach that he is not then obliged to begin all over again; the nature of the Gregorian series, they say, does not absolutely demand that there shall be no interruption, since the Church allows it during Holy Week. As regards the ecclesiastical law, it ceases to bind when we cannot observe it without grave inconvenience, and a loss of even a small sum of money would be a sufficient excuse for certain priests. We may suppose, moreover, that the will of the giver of the stipend regarded rather the number of Masses than their rigorously consecutive celebration; the omission of an accidental circumstance is not enough to oblige the celebrant to repeat Masses which have already been said. Some authors recommend, however, that this omission be atoned for by one or two supplementary Masses.

These reasons, it must be conceded, are not without weight; but they do not appear to us to be sufficiently weighty to warrant us in embracing this doctrine. For we must not forget that a *grave* clause in the contract has not been fulfilled, for the Gregorian series supposes by its very definition, that the Masses shall be celebrated without interruption. The giver of the stipend has subjected himself to a possibly serious sacrifice to secure the special graces of this series of Masses; he would be very much disappointed if he knew that his desires were not carried out and the confidence of the faithful generally would be shaken. Moreover, the celebrant ordinarily (not to say always) receives a special compensation for these Masses in the shape of a larger stipend. The *Codex* (c. 829) holds that the priest is bound to celebrate the Masses for which he has received a stipend, *even if the stipend is lost without any fault on his part;* why, then, should he not be bound to complete the Gregorian series of thirty Masses, even in cases of involuntary interruption? The Church teaches that Gregorian series supposes the consecutive celebration

of the Masses; and only the Church can dispense from this condition.

Consequently the opinion cited above does not appear to be admissible, except when, because of the express declaration of the giver of the stipend, or because of the fact that the stipend offered was very little or even nothing at all, it is morally certain that the one who asked for the Masses does not insist on the consecutive celebration of the Masses. We believe, however, that such a case would be very exceptional. Therefore, in practice, we propose one of the two following solutions: when the involuntary interruption of the series takes place at the beginning of the series, it must be begun over again or an agreement be had with the giver of the stipend; when the number of the Masses to be repeated represents for the celebrant the loss of a considerable sum of money, if it is not possible or if it is not prudent to ask the giver of the stipend for the cancellation of the obligation, recourse may be had to the Holy See and a *condonation* asked for, setting forth in the petition the motives for the interruption and the special reasons which justify the petition.[199]

CHAPTER VII

Objects Necessary for the Sacrifice

These things are the sacred vessels, the sacred linens, the priestly vestments. We shall offer also a few observations concerning the garnishing and decoration of the altar.

Article I.—The Sacred Vessels

There are two of these sacred vessels, the chalice and the paten.

157. THE CHALICE, *de jure ordinario,* must be of gold or silver, or at least the cup must be of silver and plated with gold on the inside.[200] Any other material, glass, wood, copper, tin, is forbidden.

199. In his *Summarium,* ed. 1919, p. 348, Arregui maintained the first opinion. In the edition of 1921 (n. 561), he admits the obligation of beginning the entire series over again, or of having recourse to composition. However, when the involuntary interruption takes place towards the end of the series, it is allowed to presume that the giver of the stipends does not demand that the series be begun over.

200. The goldplating is a mark of respect, and a precaution against any alteration of the species of the Precious Blood; therefore it must cover all those parts which come in contact with the sacred species. And this obligation is grave (c. 1305, No. 2). When one cannot have a chalice that is all gold or all silver, it is enough if the foot and the stem are of seemly and solid material.

However, in case of necessity, or even by reason of poverty, and without the need of asking permission from the Holy See or from the Bishop, it is allowed to use chalices whose cup (and only the cup) is made of gold, silver, or *tin.*

Pius IX also gave permission, for certain countries and under certain conditions (cf. *Acta S. Sedis,* VI, p. 588), to use chalices made of a mixture of copper and aluminum (white copper).

158. The chalice must be consecrated by a Bishop, or by a priest who is empowered by the law or by an indult from the Holy See to do so. The *Codex* grants this power to Cardinals, Vicars- and Prefects-Apostolic, Abbots and Prelates *nullius;* but those who do not possess the episcopal character must use holy oils which have been blessed by a bishop.

All the authorities hold that this consecration is obligatory *sub gravi,* and it is no longer held that the use (whether in good faith or in bad faith) of the chalice or the paten for the Holy Sacrifice dispenses from the necessity of having it consecrated.

159. This consecration may be lost, and then the chalice must be consecrated over again. This happens: 1:—when the chalice has been damaged or broken to such an extent that it can no longer be used properly for the Holy Sacrifice, for example, if the cup is pierced, broken, or bent, or if the stem is broken[201]; 2:—when the chalice has been profaned by shameful acts or when it has been sold at *public* sale (c. 1305, No. 1, n. 1 & 2).

The simple act of selling[202] a chalice does not destroy the consecration, any more than the use that might be made of it, in case of necessity, for profane but respectable purposes. So, too, when the goldplating wears away, there is a grave obligation of replating it, but the chalice does not lose its consecration[203] (c. 1305, No. 2).

160. THE PATEN must be goldplated, at least the top surface of it, but the rubric of the Missal does not demand (altho it is desirable) that it be made of gold or silver. Any other solid and suitable material will suffice, v.g., copper or tin.

What we have said of the consecration and the execration of a chalice applies also to the paten.

201. When the cup is joined to the foot by a screw joint, the two portions may be separated without affecting the consecration of the chalice. According to Schmalzgrueber, when the foot of the chalice is removable, the consecration is inherent to the cup alone.

202. It is not forbidden to sell or exchange consecrated objects, provided that the fact of their consecration does not enter into the determination of the price (c. 1539).

203. A priest who says Mass in a strange church may, therefore, without scruple use the chalice that is furnished him, even tho the goldplating is worn away.

Article II.—The Sacred Linens

There are three of these; the corporal, the pall, and the purificator.

161. THE CORPORAL. Its purpose is to hold the *Body* of Our Lord. It must be pure linen or hemp; any other material is forbidden; for instance, wool, silk, cotton, a mixture of linen or cotton, etc. It must be white thruout, without any silk or gold embroidery or ornamentation in the middle; but an edging of lace or embroidery is permitted. Usually a small cross is worked on the front portion; this is neither prescribed nor forbidden.

The corporal must be blessed; and this blessing is reserved to the Ordinary of the place or to his delegate, or to the rector of the church to which the corporal belongs.

The causes which bring about the loss of consecration of a chalice also destroy the blessing received by a corporal.[204]

162. THE PALL[205] must be of the same material as the corporal, and must also be blessed; the blessing may be given to both of these linens at the same time or separately; but always with the same formula, which must always be said without any change.

It is not forbidden to make the pall in the shape of an envelope and to put inside of it a piece of stiff cardboard. In this case, it is enough if the side which touches the chalice is of linen or hemp;[206] the upper side may be of silk and may be embroidered, but it must not be black and it must not bear any mortuary emblems.

It would be only a venial sin to celebrate without a pall, or with a pall that is not blessed. To avoid a long delay, it is permitted to substitute for the pall a purificator, or the burse which holds the corporal.

163. THE PURIFICATOR must likewise be of linen or hemp. It may be embroidered around the edges. It is not blessed. And the use of the purificator is prescribed only *sub levi.*[207]

---

204. It would be a mortal sin to say Mass without a corporal or with a dirty corporal. It would be only a venial sin to say Mass with a corporal that is not blessed.

205. In the early ages, the chalice was covered by drawing up a corner of the corporal over the cup; for greater convenience, they later on separated this portion of the corporal, which became our present pall.

206. It is, moreover, required that this side, which is the real pall, may be readily separated from the rest for washing.

207. When the priest goes to the altar, the chalice should be covered with a veil, at least the front of it; and the corporal should be in a burse, even when giving Communion *extra Missam.*

The veil and the burse are of the same material and of the same color as the vestments of the day. It would probably be no sin to do without one or the other of them occasionally.

164. The *Codex* commands that the necessary precautions shall be taken to see that the sacred vessels and the sacred linens which have been used in the Holy Sacrifice[208] shall not be touched except by clerics (at least tonsured) and by those entrusted with their care (c. 1306, No. 1).

It follows from this Canon that, without any special permission from the Ordinary, all clerics as well as the persons (lay[209] or religious) who have been given charge of the sacristy, have the right to touch the sacred vessels (when they do not contain the Holy Eucharist and when they have been purified) and the sacred linens (even tho not yet purified).

As regards other persons, there is no formal prohibition under pain of sin, as is plain from the terms of the Canon quoted above (unless in case of scandal), but respect for the objects connected with the Holy Sacrifice should forbid it.

On the other hand, when the sacred vessels contain the Sacred Species, it would be a mortal sin for anyone who has not received the order of deaconship, to touch them.

165. It is explicity forbidden (but only *sub levi*) to permit lay persons, even religious, to wash purificators, palls, and corporals which have been used in the Holy Mass, before they have been purified one first time by a cleric who is at least a subdeacon (c. 1306, No. 2).

The *Codex* requires only this one ablution to be made by the subdeacon; but the Bishop has not the right to permit a lay person, a religious (male or female), or even a tonsured cleric, to perform this *first* ablution. For this an indult from the Holy See is required. On the contrary, no authorization is required to permit a nun, or even a simple lay person, to perform the second and third ablutions of the sacred linens; and indeed, these second and third ablutions are not in any manner prescribed.

The water which was used for the first ablution must be thrown into the *piscina,* or, if there is no *piscina,* into the fire.[210]

208. It is not wrong for anybody to touch a corporal which has served for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, or the sacred linens after they have been purified.

209. Ordinarily lay sacristans in the smaller churches have not, properly speaking, charge of the sacred vessels, and therefore they may not make use of the privilege referred to above. In any case, they should refrain from *publicly* touching the sacred vessels and the sacred linens, and if they are bidden to do so, they should first put on cassock and surplice.

210. It would not be a mortal sin to disregard this rule, except when, thru contempt or culpable negligence, the water is thrown in an unbecoming place. If there is no *piscina,* the custom of digging a hole in the ground to receive the ablutions, does not seem wrong.

It might be a mortal sin to say Mass with linens or vestments which are repulsively

Article III—The Sacerdotal Vestments

166. By the sacerdotal vestments we mean those which are necessary for the priest when saying Mass. They are: the amice, the alb, the cincture, the maniple, the stole, and the chasuble.[211]

These vestments are not all equally necessary, but ordinarily it would be a mortal sin to say Mass without alb or without chasuble, or even, as some authors (whose opinion seems to us a bit too severe) say, without stole and without maniple.

In spite of the contrary opinion of St. Liguori, it appears certain to us that in order to provide Viaticum for a dying person a priest can say Mass without any sacred vestments at all, provided there is no contempt on his part, and no danger of scandal for the faithful. An authorization of this kind, moreover, was given to the missionaries in China during the times of persecution (Nov. 30, 1828) (cf. Ojetti, *Synopsis,* p. 656).

167. All these vestments *must* be blessed; there is room for doubt only as far as the cincture is concerned. The rector of any church can give this blessing to vestments destined for use in his church; he can even, as some authors say,[212] delegate for that purpose another priest. In case of necessity, it would not be a sin to say Mass with vestments which are not blessed.

This blessing must be reiterated when the vestments lose their form,[213] when the greater portion of them is renewed, and when they have been profaned or sold at a public sale.[214]

---

dirty. Cases of this kind cannot but be very rare. The obligation of watching over the cleanliness of the objects for the Holy Sacrifice binds in a particular and very strict manner, those men or women who have charge of the sacristy (Lehmkuhl, 323).

211. Amongst the sacred vestments must be classed the dalmatic of the deacon and the tunic of the subdeacon, the cope, the humeral veil, the veil for the chalice, and the burse for the corporal. There is no certain obligation to bless them, but it is certainly proper to do so.

212. This is the opinion of Cappello (n. 114, 7) because, he says, it is a question of ordinary power. Others hold that this right seems to be excluded by the *Codex,* which does not attribute to a simple priest the right to bless the vestments, except when he is delegated thereto by the *Ordinary* (c. 1304, 5).

The pastor has the right to bless the vestments which are to be used in the oratories which are within the limits of his parish.

The fact that a vestment has been used for saying Mass without having been blessed does not dispense with the necessity of blessing it.

213. For instance, if the corporal is so torn that it cannot accommodate the chalice and the host, if the cincture is so badly broken that none of the pieces will serve to gird the priest, if the alb or the chasuble, because of a serious tear, is not fit for use (Lehmkuhl, 324).

When these vestments are discarded, they may be used to furnish pieces for the repairing of other vestments; otherwise they are to be burnt. However, this rule does not apply to the linings, which can be used for profane purposes.

214. As to the form of the vestments, the Holy See has requested on various occasions that no change be made in the current forms without express permission, in

168. THE AMICE AND THE ALB must be of linen or hemp. It is not allowed to use any other material.

The *amice* is not required *sub gravi;* and any reasonable motive is enough to justify saying Mass without it. It must have in the center or between the strings, a small cross which the celebrant kisses before putting it on.

The *alb* is required *sub gravi,* and there must be a very grave reason to justify saying Mass without it (v.g., to provide Viaticum for a dying person). The desire to afford a large number of people the opportunity to hear Mass, even on Sunday, is not regarded as sufficient. The alb may have at the bottom and at the end of the sleeves, lace or embroidery; when this ornamentation is in linen or hemp, there is no reason why it may not reach as high as the cincture; on the other hand, it must maintain the proportions of an accessory (that is, it must not reach higher than the knee), if it is of a different material.[215]

169. THE CINCTURE is a complement of the alb; but any reasonable cause, even tho very slight, justifies saying Mass without it.

Besides linen and hemp, it may be made of other materials, such as silk, cotton, wool, etc.... ; it may be always white, or it may be of the same color as the vestments of the day.

It must have the traditional form, and it is forbidden to replace it with a band of cloth.

170. THE MANIPLE, THE STOLE, THE CHASUBLE, all must be of silk. This is required by custom, confirmed on many occasions by decrees of the Holy See. However the Congregation

---

order to prevent the wonderment of the faithful. (Letter of Cardinal Patrizzi, August 21, 1863). Therefore, *altho* the chasuble that is called *"Gothic"* is more elegant and more dignified than our French chasuble, whose stiff and narrow shape gives little evidence of the relation this vestment bears to the primitive vestments (as Mgr. de Conny says), yet *an indult is required* to introduce them in a church. However, the Holy See permits Bishops to set forth the reasons in favor of a return to the Gothic style, and it not forbidden to hope that little by little the permission which has been granted to certain dioceses may become general.

215. Under the lace of the alb, it is allowed to insert colored material, but this is not required. It is more regular that this color shall be the same as that of the vestments.

It is asked whether, in cases where the lace constitutes an important portion of the alb (v.g., when it goes as far as the waist), the separating of it from the upper part for washing unfits the alb for its purpose and entails the necessity of blessing it over. Authors differ on this point, and there has been no express decision from the Holy See; but it would seem that, in this case, the alb has lost its primitive form and must be blessed over again. It would be different if the lace were only an accessory, and did not go above the knees.

of Rites authorizes the use of cloth of gold or cloth of silver,[216] or of cloth made of a mixture of silk thread and silver thread.

This rule applies to only the chief material; the lining and the accessories (medallions, galoons, crosses) may be of wool, or cotton, or imitation gold or silver. It is more seemly, so far as is possible, to make them of silk and of the color of the vestment.

Moreover, in poor churches, it is not forbidden to use vestments made of a mixture of silk and cotton, or wool, or linen, provided that the silk is plainly to be seen. But the Congregation of Rites prohibits the use of vestments made entirely of wool, or cotton; it also prohibits vestments made of glass cloth or any non-textile material.

The vestments may be adorned with embroidery or paintings.

171. THE LITURGICAL COLORS of the sacerdotal vestments are: white, red, green, violet, and black.[217]

Rose color is permitted on the third Sunday of Advent and the fourth Sunday of Lent.[218]

Multicolored vestments may be used, if there is one predominant color, on the days when that color is prescribed.

Cloth of silver may take the place of white; cloth of gold (real cloth of gold) may be used instead of white, red, or even green.

It is not forbidden to use vestments which are of one color on one side and a different color on the other side.

172. There is an obligation (*sub levi*)[219] to follow the rubric which relates to the color of the vestments; and, to justify the ignoring of that rubric, it is not enough to allege that the vestments which are available in the color of the day are not rich enough. However, it would be better to say Mass in any color at all than not to say Mass; and in order to justify saying Mass in vestments

---

216. Gold and silver are permitted because of their intrinsic value and not because of their color. It follows from this that if a cloth that is woven of gold thread, or of silver-gilt threads, is permitted, cloth that is made of a material which imitates gold, or that is made of threads of *yellow* silk, is forbidden. The color of gold is not a liturgical color.

217. It is the color of the fundamental material and not the color of the accessories, that distinguishes the vestments.
When ornamentations are sown on a black vestment, they must not be white; generally gold is used, or yellow silk.

218. Certain dioceses (in Spain or Latin America) have the privilege of using blue for the feast of the Immaculate Conception. Moreover, quite recently the Holy See has given permission to certain missionaries, by means of quite special indults, to substitute for all the liturgical colors except black, yellow vestments. (cf. L'Ami du Clergé, 22, 671).

219. The sin might become mortal, by reason of the scandal given, v.g., if a priest said Mass on Easter Sunday in black vestments.

which are not of the color of the day, it is sufficient if the supply of vestments runs short because of the large number of priests who are saying Mass.

Article IV.—The Furnishings of the Altar

This furniture comprizes, according to the Rubrics of the Missal, the altarcloths, the antependium, the cross, the candlesticks with their candles, the altarcards, a cushion or stand for the Missal, a bell, the cruets, and a fingertowel.

173. THE ALTARCLOTHS.—Except in case of necessity, it would be a mortal sin to say Mass without altarcloths.[220]

These cloths must be three in number; it is permitted to use only two, if one of them is folded in two. Except in case of a special indult, they must be of linen or hemp, and must be blessed by the rector of the church, or by a priest regularly delegated (cf. n. 167, note).

The top cloth must hang down to the ground on each side of the altar.[221]

174. THE ANTEPENDIUM (or *pallium*).—This is a hanging (of unspecified material, provided it is seemly, but ordinarily of silk), which completely covers the anterior front of the altar (and even the rear face, if the altar is isolated in the middle of the sanctuary). It is fitting, say the liturgists, that it should have in the middle a cross or pious image.

This hanging must be, so far as possible, of the color of the day. For a Requiem Mass it is violet; for expositions of the Blessed Sacrament, it must be white.

If the altar is of marble, or if it is richly decorated in itself, the use of the antependium may be dispensed with; the Holy See does not protest against the custom of many dioceses in which the antependium is not used. It is oftentimes replaced by a valance; this ornament is not prohibited, especially for altars whose upper part is too barren of adornment, but it does not express, as the antependium does, the mysterious symbolism desired by the Church.

175. THE CROSS.—To recall the identity of the sacrifice of the altar and the sacrifice of Calvary, the Church requires that

220. It would be only a venial sin to say Mass with one or with two altarcloths, or with altarcloths which are not blessed.

221. Underneath the altarcloths, on a fixed altar whose whole table is consecrated, a waxed cloth is placed.

there shall be on every altar a crucifix[222] large enough to permit it to be seen easily by the priest and the faithful.

A cross is necessary even on altars where the Blessed Sacrament is kept. It is not obligatory, altho permitted, when Mass is said before the Blessed Sacrament exposed.

This cross need not be blessed. Any priest can bless it privately; the solemn blessing is reserved to the Bishop or to his delegate (c. 1270, No. 4).

176. CANDLES AND CANDLESTICKS.—The Church requires that during the Mass, lighted candles shall burn on the altar; they are a sign of respect for the Holy Victim and a symbol of Our Lord Himself. All authorities say that it would be a mortal sin to say Mass without lights;[223] but it would be only a venial sin to say Mass with but one candle, or with candles of defective quality, or with oil lamps.[224]

The candles used on the altar must be of beeswax.[225] *Stearic candles, therefore, are absolutely excluded from liturgical use,* and must never appear on the altar (except to provide light for reading the Missal), even for the purpose of making the illumination of the altar more brilliant. However, because of the difficulty of procuring beeswax, and for the purpose of guarding against indiscriminate mixtures, the Church sanctions the mixture of beeswax with another material of vegetable or animal origin. But the Congregation of Rites urges the Bishops to take all the precautions necessary to see that the Paschal candle and the two candles which are to be lighted during Mass shall be, at least the major portion,

---

222. A simple cross is not enough. However, it would be only a venial sin to say Mass without a crucifix, or even without a cross.
The cross stands between the candlesticks, and is so placed that it is higher than the highest candlesticks; it may stand upon the tabernacle, but it is forbidden to place it upon the corporal, or on the throne which serves for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.
It would not be required if there were, above the altar, or behind it, a large crucifix which is easily seen, or, according to Benedict XIV, if the reredos of the altar bore a painting in which the image of the divine Crucified One occupied the principal place.

223. However, in case of necessity (v.g., to provide Viaticum for a dying person, or even for the purpose of not depriving the faithful of Mass on a day of obligation) it is not forbidden, in spite of the contrary opinion of St. Liguori, to say Mass without a light.

224. If the candles become extinguished during the Mass, the priest should wait for a few moments while they are being relit. If it were impossible to have them relighted, the celebrant would go on with the Mass, especially if the accident occurred after the Offertory.

225. The candles must be of bleached (yellow) wax; the unbleached (brown) wax is to be used only for funerals, for Good Friday, and for the three services of "Tenebrae."

of beeswax; in the other candles which are placed upon the altar, the wax must form the principal part or at least a notable part of the mixture. The rectors of churches have only to follow the rules laid down by the Ordinary; and the priest who says Mass has no occasion to worry about the quality of the candles on the altar (S. R. C., Dec. 14, 1904).

177. It is forbidden to replace the candles with oil lamps, gas, electricity, etc. These various kinds of lights, like stearine, can be used only for the purpose of illuminating the church; and even for this purpose all that savors of the theatrical must be avoided in their disposition (S. R. C., Nov. 22, 1907).

It is likewise forbidden to illuminate the altar with electric lamps, either used by themselves, or interspersed amongst the candles. It is forbidden also, (except by very special permission from the Ordinary, cf. n. 366), to substitute electricity for the lamps or candles which are to be kept burning before the Blessed Sacrament, the holy relics, and the images of the saints.[226]

178. For *private Masses,* the rubrics authorize only two candles;[227] only Bishops and Cardinals may have four or more, even on ordinary days.

When the Mass is not strictly private (v.g. a parish or community Mass), it is permitted on feast days to have four or more lighted candles on the altar. But it is not allowed to do this as a mark of honor to the celebrant if he is neither a Cardinal nor a Bishop.

In Masses sung without sacred ministers (*Missae cantatae*), four candles are required.

In solemn Masses (with deacon and subdeacon), the rubrics suppose that six lighted candles are used; they likewise suppose a seventh, which is placed in the middle of the others, when *the Bishop of the place* is singing a Pontifical Mass.[228] (This rule does not apply to Requiem Masses).

179. The candles must be in candlesticks arranged on the table of the altar or on the part of the altar behind it, on a little shelf, but not attached to the wall of the church.

226. It is not forbidden (but it is less proper) to use metal tubes containing a spring which keeps the wax candle in place.

227. The rubric which requires a third candle from the *Sanctus* on, is no longer observed anywhere.

228. Here we have, no doubt, a reminder of the seven symbolical candlesticks of the Apocalypse. "The Bishop, who represents Christ, will also walk in the midst of seven candlesticks" (Batiffol, *Leçons sur la Messe,* p. 75).

The candlesticks may be of metal, wood, marble, etc. It is preferable that they be of varying heights, and that they rise gradually towards the cross. They must not, especially on feast days, be covered with a veil to protect them from dust.

At the high altar and at the Blessed Sacrament altar, there must be six candlesticks; they cannot be replaced by candlesticks having several branches.

180. THE MISSAL.—According to the common opinion, there is a grave obligation to have on the altar, during the celebration of the Mass, a Missal containing at least the Canon, in order to guard against lapses of memory and against all danger of errors in so important a matter.[229]

However, most authors admit that a priest may say Mass without a Missal, if he knows from experience that there is no danger of going astray, and if, moreover, there is a legitimate excuse for so doing, v.g., the difficulty of securing a Missal at once.[230]

181. THE ALTARCARDS.—The rubric prescribes that there shall be, at the foot of the cross, a *tabula secretorum.* This custom does not date back further than the 16th century. In the course of time a card for the Gospel according to St. John was added, and then, for symmetry's sake, another containing the prayers relating to the mixture of the wine and water and to the washing of the hands.

The altarcards should not remain on the altar outside the time of Mass. When Mass is over, it is well to remove them (and it is obligatory to do so during the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament), or at the very least to conceal them beneath the cloth which covers the altar.

Only the card for the "secret" prayers is obligatory; and it would be only a venial sin to do without that.

182. THE MISSAL-CUSHION, THE BELL, and THE CRUETS.—*The cushion* for the Missal may be of any suitable material. Almost everywhere nowadays it is replaced by a stand of wood or metal.

The use of a *bell* is obligatory at the *Sanctus* and at the eleva-

229. However, there is no sin in reciting from memory the prayers of the Mass, without following the text of the Missal with the eyes, provided that priest is morally certain that he will not go astray. The Missal still retains its usefulness; it enables the priest, in case of error, to make up what he has forgotten.

230. A blind priest who knows all the prayers of the Mass by heart, still needs permission from the Holy See to say Mass, since he is irregular.

tion, in sung Masses or pontifical Masses as well as in low Masses. It is well also, when the elevation is approaching, to ring it as a signal for the congregation to recollect themselves[231] (S. R. C., Oct. 25, 1922).

The bell must be rung in private oratories, and at Masses where there is no one present; for it is a sign of honor and joy which, at the *Sanctus,* accompanies the praise of heaven to the thrice holy God, and at the elevation, hails the coming of Jesus Christ upon the altar.

On the other hand, the bell must not be rung in a church where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed; it is likewise forbidden if the noise were apt to disturb the singing of the Office, the holding of a procession, or the recitation of public prayers.

The *cruets* must be of glass; custom also permits the use of cruets of gold or silver.

183. FLOWERS, RELIQUARIES, AND STATUES OF THE SAINTS form a part of the decoration of the altar. The Ceremonial of Bishops recommends their use; but all exaggeration in this matter must be avoided.

They are usually placed on the gradines of the altar, between the candlesticks. It is forbidden to place flowers on the table of the altar, and especially in front of the door of the tabernacle; they should be put lower down, on a support, or on the platform of the altar.

Preference should be given to natural flowers;[232] but artificial flowers are not forbidden, provided that they are seemly and artistic, that is, made, as far as possible, out of silk or fine muslin. Flowers made of colored paper or of gilt or silver paper are not in harmony with the dignity of the altar.

These flowers must be arranged tastefully (*vascula studiose ornata,* says the Ceremonial of Bishops). It is well that they should not reach higher than the bobeches of the candlesticks.

---

231. In France, besides the times indicated above, it is the custom to ring the bell at the beginning of the Mass, at the *Domine non sum dignus,* and even at other times, so that strangers often reproach us with " over-fondness for the bell" (Fortescue. *La Messe,* p. 453). This custom, however, has its advantages, and may be retained unless it is a temptation to the altarboy to make too much noise.

232. This does not in any way give authority to the use of sheaves of wheat, which are sometimes placed on the altar for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

We must likewise avoid placing flowerpots *on the altar,* or loading the altar down with enormous plants and very large flowers. The Ceremonial of Bishops mentions only "small flowers" and "small vases;" the decoration of the altar should always be simple and discreet.

They must not be covered with a globe, much less, mixed with electric lights.

During funeral services, and at services during the penitential seasons (Lent and Advent), it is forbidden to put flowers and relics on the altar, except on the third Sunday of Advent and the fourth Sunday of Lent. However, the use of flowers on the altar of St. Joseph during March is tolerated, and even on the high altar, on the occasion of some special solemnity, v.g., the First Communion of children.[233] (Ami du Clergé, 24, 524).

CHAPTER VIII

The Matter and Form of the Eucharist

Article I.—The Matter of the Eucharist

184. The matter of the Eucharist is twofold; it consists of both bread and wine. Our Lord Himself ordained this when he instituted the Eucharist, and when He gave His apostles the command to repeat what He had just done.

These two elements are absolutely necessary; and it is never permitted to consecrate one of them without the other, even in case of extreme necessity (c. 817), v.g., to provide Viaticum for a dying person. Most authors hold that even the Sovereign Pontiff has not the power to dispense in this matter, which is of divine institution. For Christ commanded that the sacrifice should be offered under both species (cf. n. 9, 3°), and that the sacrament should be a consequence of the sacrifice.[234]

---

233. The rubric adds this warning; "We should put on the altar nothing that does not serve the sacrifice or the adornment of the altar." It is wrong, therefore, to allow the biretta, or a handkerchief, or anything of that sort, to lie upon the altar. Outside the time of services, it is well to cover the altar with a cloth; but this cloth must be entirely removed during services.

Let us add that the Holy See seems disinclined to approve the custom which is creeping into many churches, of decorating the sanctuary or even the altar with the tricolor (the French flag), even when it is adorned with the emblem of the Sacred Heart.

234. Nevertheless, the consecration of only one species is valid, even when, (as theologians commonly hold), the priest positively excludes the consecration of the other species. De Lugo himself does not deny its validity except when the priest absolutely excludes the intention of offering the Holy Sacrifice even partially (Disput., 19, sect. 8, n. 104). Provided that the priest has at least an implicit intention of consecrating the matter that is present, and of thus commencing the Holy Sacrifice, there is nothing lacking for the validity of the consecration (Cappello, n. 265).

In certain cases, this consecration of only one species may be licit; a priest would not be guilty of any sin if, having commenced the Mass with the intention of making the two consecrations, he found it impossible to complete the sacrifice, either because of danger suddenly arising after the consecration of the bread, or because there were no

No. 1.—Conditions for the Validity of the Matter

185. "The bread for the Eucharist must be made exclusively of wheat, and must be baked recently enough to avoid all danger of corruption. The wine must be natural wine made from grapes, and uncorrupted" (c. 815).

For only these two elements prepared in this fashion deserve the name of bread and wine, and are generally regarded as such.

1:—THE BREAD

To be valid matter for the sacrament, the bread must be: (1)—made of wheaten flour; (2)—moistened with natural water; (3)—baked with fire; (4)—not completely corrupted.

186. 1. *It must be made of wheaten flour.* The bread that is made of barley, rice, oats, chestnuts, potatoes, maize, beans, and all other vegetables or fruits from any kind of tree is most certainly invalid. The same is true of bread composed of a mixture of wheat and any of the above mentioned materials in such proportions that it cannot be regarded as ordinary bread; a small quantity of foreign matter, however, would make it only illicit.

187. There are various kinds of wheat; and all of them may constitute valid matter for the sacrament. But it is difficult at times to know whether a grain is wheat or a different species. To solve the difficulty it is neither necessary nor useful to have recourse to a scientific analysis; all one need do is to inquire of the inhabitants of the locality, that is, those who know the real wheat and real wheaten bread.[235]

188. 2. *The Eucharistic bread must be made with natural water.*—If it is made with wine, oil, milk, distilled water, it is no

---

means of procuring other bread or wine when he discovered that he had used an invalid matter.

But, as a general rule, whenever it is possible, the sacrifice is to be completed; and to that end, the consecration is to be repeated, *under both species.* If, therefore, when receiving Communion, the celebrant notices that the matter which he has put in the chalice is not wine, he has only to pour what is left (except the particle of the consecrated Host) into a vessel; then, without bothering himself about not being fasting, he takes another host, again puts wine and water in the chalice, makes a mental offering, begins at the *Qui pridie,* goes thru the consecration, and at once consumes the sacred species. In order to avoid causing astonishment or scandal to those present, it will suffice, according to the Rubric (tit. IV, n. 5, de defect.), to consecrate under the species of wine alone.

235. Transplanted to certain varying climates, wheat may produce grain that looks different, but which is none the less valid and licit matter for the Holy Eucharist.

Starch has no nutritive value, and cannot be used for the Eucharistic bread.

longer bread properly speaking, and would be very doubtful matter for the sacrament. The same is true if, with the flour, a large quantity of butter, eggs, sugar, or other substance is mixed. On the other hand, a small quantity of these various substances does not militate against the validity of the sacrament.[236] It is not forbidden to put a little salt into the water which is used to make the dough.

189. 3. *The Eucharistic bread must be baked with fire.* The manner in which it is baked makes very little difference; but we cannot consider as valid matter a paste made of boiled flour, or a paste which is hardened by exposure to the sun, or simply sun-dried. These various substances cannot be classed as bread.

190. 4. *The Eucharistic bread must not be corrupted.* For in that case it would no longer be bread. Therefore the rubrics of the Missal demand that the priest shall consecrate another host, if he notices that the first one is corrupted.

When the corruption is only partial, the consecration is valid. However, there always remains the obligation not to make use of such bread.

2:—THE WINE

The Eucharistic wine must, under pain of nullity, be natural wine made from grapes, and not corrupted (c. 815, No. 2).

191. 1. *Wine made from grapes.*—No importance is attached to the color, the taste, the aroma, the strength of the wine, or the origin or quality of the vine. But it is required that the essential elements of the wine, the alcohol, the sugar, the coloring substance, come from the vine, at least in a proportion very notably superior to the rest.[237] Other substances may be added (ferments, and a little water) which do not come from the vine, but which are necessary or useful to aid the process of fermentation.

Moreover, this product is truly wine only if the grapes from which it is made had *at least begun* to ripen, and if fermentation

---

236. If this substance, even in slight quantities, adulterates the wheat flour, the product thus obtained would not be valid matter. This is *usually* the case with colored wafers.

Remark that sea water is natural water, and may serve, in case of necessity, for the preparation of bread.

This preparation itself demands that the wheat shall be made into flour and carefully sifted; but to secure valid matter, it is enough to grind the flour.

237. Chemical analysis, therefore, cannot prove the validity of the wine; the presence of most of the elements which compose it does not prove that these elements come from the vine.

has already *begun*. But there is always a beginning of fermentation as soon as the grapes are crushed.

192. Therefore we must consider as *invalid* matter; all liquors extracted from the fruits of any tree or from any plant other than the vine; vinegar which differs substantially from wine, and also alcohol derived from wine; any liquor produced chemically, even tho it may contain (if this is possible) all the elements of wine; liqueurs, which are nothing more than alcoholized syrups (this is often the case with wines sold under the names of malaga, madeira, etc.); wine produced from grapes that are too green;[238] the second wine (or *"piquette"*) which is made by pouring water upon the grapes from which the juice has already been extracted.[239]

A wine that is so weak that it does not contain even 5% of alcohol, does not deserve to be called wine, any more than one which contains[240] more than 30% (Noldin, n. 107). Remark, however, that the taste of wine may disappear altho a sufficient percentage of alcohol may remain.

193. 2. Wine that is not corrupted.—This "corruption" may come either from the change of wine into vinegar, or from its becoming putrid and no longer fit to drink.

When the wine is merely beginning to become corrupted,[241] it is still valid matter, but illicit.

No. 2. Conditions for the Liceity of the Matter

1. THE BREAD

194. 1. Every priest is bound to follow his own rite, no matter where he may be saying Mass. The priests of the Latin rite must use unleavened bread, and most of the Oriental priests must use leaven bread. (c. 816).

---

238. Potable wine is obtained by adding to green grapes a certain amount of sugar; but this addition, if considerable, would make of the wine a matter that was at least illicit.

239. If any juice remained in the grape, the liquor obtained by adding a little sugar might be wine; but it would always be an illicit matter, and even a very doubtful matter, if the quantity thus obtained were greater or equal to the first pressing. As a general rule it is not really grape wine; the foreign sugar enters too strongly into its composition.

240. When a wine is more than 18 degrees in strength, it owes its alcoholic excess to the addition of extraneous alcohol; for the must ceases to ferment as soon as the wine reaches a strength of 16 to 18 degrees.

241. The wine may turn sour because it is fermenting over again. Wine that is working in this manner must not be taken for wine that is corrupted.

This is only a matter of discipline, since Our Lord did not specify the kind of bread to use, and since the Church declared in the Council of Florence that either kind is valid. But this rule is nevertheless a grave precept.[242]

The authors of former days admitted only one exception to this rule, and that a very theoretical one; namely, the necessity of completing the sacrifice in a case where it would be impossible to replace the leavened or unleavened bread with other bread of the same kind.[243]

They maintained, on the other hand, that in the Orient a priest of the Latin rite could say Mass with leavened bread, and likewise, that in the West a priest of the Greek rite could say Mass with unleavened bread. The *Codex* now makes it obligatory for the celebrant to follow his own rite *everywhere*.

195. 2. The Eucharistic bread must be made out of pure wheat flour, without any foreign mixture.

In these days, more than ever before, the flours sold generally are in danger of being mixed with various substances, vegetable or mineral. It is necessary, therefore, to be very careful, and unless there are very special reasons to justify doing so, it would be a sin (and even a mortal sin) to purchase flour for the divine services from strangers.

196. 3. The hosts to be consecrated must be of recent baking (Rit. Rom., tit. IV, c. 1, n. 7). No precise rule can be laid down that will hold good for all seasons and all climates; the danger of corruption varies with the quality of the flour, the method used in baking, etc.; many authors say that this danger is to be feared when the hosts are a month old.[244]

242. The preference of the Latin Church for unleavened bread arises from the following causes: it is more probable that Christ instituted the Eucharist with unleavened bread; the symbolism of that bread is richer than that of fermented bread, because the yeast mixed with the dough contains a principle of corruption; and finally, unleavened bread keeps better.

243. Since the Church allows all the faithful to receive Communion according to either rite, it is not forbidden to hold that a priest of the Latin rite could celebrate Mass with fermented bread (or that a Greek priest could celebrate with unleavened bread), if this were necessary to provide Viaticum for a dying person. An ecclesiastical precept should not, it would seem, hinder the observance of a divine precept (Cappello, n. 281). But the Church is the only judge in this doubtful case. According to St. Alphonsus, the common and more probable opinion does not permit the change of rite, even for this grave reason.

244. In 1826, the Congregation of Rites declared, for Belgium, that it would be an abuse to consecrate hosts that were made three months before (in the wintertime) or six months before (in the summer).

From a more recent declaration of the Congregation of the Sacraments (A. A. S., XI, n. 1, p. 8) it follows that hosts which are two or three months old cannot be be considered as *recent*; and this rule applies to all seasons and all places.

197. 4. Finally, the hosts should be clean, whole, and without any signs of corruption. The gravity of the sin in this matter depends on the gravity of the negligence displayed, and also on the nature of the obligation to say Mass.

In the Latin Church, the host must be round,[245] and larger in size for the priest than for the faithful. However, even the motive of devotion would justify a priest in saying Mass with a small host.

It is evident also that the hosts must be of reasonable dimensions, neither too large nor too small (about 8 centimeters for the priest and about 3 centimeters for the faithful). True, as regards the validity of the consecration, it is enough that a particle be visible to the eye; but it would be lacking in respect for the Blessed Sacrament to consecrate such tiny fragments.

2. THE WINE

198. 1. The wine must be fermented. This condition is required in order that it may be real wine, in the current signification of the word. The use of must, even when it is strained, is forbidden.

199. 2. The wine must be free from any admixture of any other substance.[246] Therefore, even when it is desired to prevent the possibility of corruption, it is better to heat it to about 65 degrees Centigrade than to add brandy to it.

Any addition of any kind whatsoever (of water or of liquor) makes the matter more or less illicit; and the sin would be a mortal one if this mixture rendered the matter doubtful (for instance, one third of water and two thirds of light wine).

However, it is sometimes allowed, *for a just reason,* to add to the wine a little water, or alcohol, or sugar; a little water (for instance, 3%), if the wine is too strong or too sweet and it is im-

245. There is no rule which demands that the host shall bear the image of the crucifix or any other pious emblem.

Amongst the Greeks, the Eucharistic bread is square for the sacrifice, and triangular for the Communion of the faithful.

246. What we said above (n. 195) concerning the flour for the hosts, applies still more strongly to the wine for the Mass, for there is artificial wine which even experts cannot distinguish from genuine wine. It would be very unwise to trust to the assurances of a merchant, even though he were a good Catholic and of the best intentions in the world, for the wines that he handles may have undergone, without his knowledge, original or intermediary doctorings which might easily compromise their sacramental validity. Therefore, if the priest cannot himself make the wine he needs for the Holy Sacrifice, he should buy from only those houses which are recommended by the ecclesiastical authorities. The Holy See has many times called attention to the precautions that should be taken on this subject. (Circular of the Holy Office, August 30, 1901).

possible to get any other;[247] a little sugar (2 or 3%) if it is necessary to counteract the bitterness of the only wine that can be had; a little alcohol, if it is desired to preserve or to send to a distant place wine that is too weak, "provided that *wine alcohol* is used, that the final alcoholic strength does not exceed 12 degrees, and that wine of recent manufacture is used in making the mixture." Such are the conditions laid down by the Holy Office[248] (July 30, 1890).

200. 3. The wine must not be soured or turning sour. A sin against this rule is more or less grave according to the degree of sourness; but in case of necessity it would be permissible to say Mass with soured wine *provided that it is still wine.*[249]

201. 4. It is forbidden to consecrate wine that is too weak, for if it contains only a trifling amount of alcohol (4 or 5%), it is in danger of not being wine at all.

5. It is also forbidden to consecrate frozen wine, except in case of necessity.[250]

202. On the other hand, it is allowed to consecrate wine that is *made from raisins,* provided that it has the color, the odor, and the taste of wine (Holy Office, April 10, 1889). This wine may be made either by simply mixing raisins with fresh grapes in order to obtain from the fermentation a product that is richer in alcohol, or by using only raisins. In this latter case, water is added, in quantity two or three times the weight of the raisins, according to their richness in sugar. When the raisins have soaked some hours and are distended with water, they are taken out and put in the press. The work of making the wine goes on in exactly the same manner as when fresh grapes are used.

The Holy See has never said that the use of wine thus made is limited to cases of necessity.

---

247. Most theologians demand that this mixture be made before the end of the fermentation.

248. On the 5th of August, 1896, the Holy Office, *in a special case,* permitted the raising of the strength of the wine to 17 or 18 degrees, provided that the mixture was made before fermentation was completed.

While recommending the use of grape alcohol, the Holy Office does not absolutely forbid the use of cane sugar (August 5, 1896).

249. The mere motive of devotion justifies saying Mass with wine that is slightly sour.

Care must be taken not to confuse vinegar with sour wine whose sharpness comes from the fact that it was made from grapes that were a little green; this wine is licit, and there is no obligation to make it milder by mixing sugar with it.

250. If the wine freezes after the consecration, it must be melted by wrapping hot cloths about the chalice; if it freezes before the consecration, it is allowed to take other wine and repeat the oblation.

No. 3. Concerning the Water which is Added to the Wine

203. A small quantity of water is to be added to Eucharistic wine (c. 814). This mixture is to be made during the celebration of the Mass, at the Offertory, or, in case of forgetfulness, before (but never after) the consecration of the chalice.

This is only an ecclesiastical precept which has nothing to do with the validity of the sacrifice. Nevertheless, the obligation is a grave one, and only a case of extreme necessity,[251] or the desire to complete the sacrifice, could dispense from it.

204. The water must be *natural* water. This does not exclude water which is naturally acidulated, gaseous, or alkaline. Only a small quantity is to be used, that is, a few drops; however, all scrupulosity on this point must be avoided, for reputable authors say that a quantity of water equalling one-fifth or even one-fourth of the wine does not substantially alter the wine. If the water were equal to one-third of the wine, the matter would be doubtful, unless the wine were very strong (Lehmkuhl 165).

Article II.—The Consecration of the Eucharistic Matter

No. 1. Conditions for Validity

205. 1. The Eucharistic matter can be validly consecrated only when it is truly in the presence of the celebrant. This is plain from the words of consecration, "This is My Body"; "This" refers to an object that is present to the speaker. It is plain also from the example of Our Lord which we must necessarily imitate. However, it is not necessary that this presence be actually perceived by the senses; it is enough if it is possible to be thus perceived, for in this manner the meaning of the word "This" is realized.

206. From this principle the conclusion follows that matter which is at a considerable distance[252] from the priest (ten, twenty, thirty, or fifty feet, according to some authors), or behind him, or behind a wall which is in front of him, or in a closed tabernacle, cannot be validly consecrated.

---

251. According to certain authors, it is never permitted to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice without water, even for the purpose of providing Viaticum for a dying person (Vermeersch, Epitone, II, n. 84). This opinion seems to us to be too severe. This ceremony is purely symbolical; the Eucharistic water is a figure of the water which issued together with the blood from the lance-pierced side of Christ; and the mixture of the wine and the water, as indicated by the prayers which accompany it, signify our union with the Son of God.

252. It seems to us that a distance of twenty feet is considerable, when it is a question of a small host.

On the other hand, a blind priest can validly consecrate hosts placed in front of him; so too with hosts which are in a covered ciborium, or wine contained in a covered chalice—they are certainly consecrated; for the thing contained is clearly signified by the container.

Theologians regard as *speculatively* probable the consecration of a host which is under the corporal or the altarcloth, etc., while they hold that *practically* it is doubtful.[253] To avoid all doubt, the priest should formulate, once for all, the intention to consecrate *only those hosts which are placed upon the corporal.*

207. 2. The matter must be certain and specifically determined by means of an actual or virtual intention, as indicated by the words of consecration.

There would be no consecration, therefore, if the priest had failed to notice the ciborium which another priest had placed upon the altar. However, if the ciborium were placed upon the corporal, and the celebrant had formulated an intention to consecrate whatever matter was so placed, the consecration would be valid. And all authors recommend the forming of such a general intention.

Again, there would be no consecration, because of lack of determination, if the celebrant wished to consecrate "a third of the hosts in the ciborium," without distinguishing them in any other fashion.

On the contrary, he would validly consecrate three or four hosts which he clearly specified in the midst of the other hosts. In like manner, there is no room for doubt as to the validity of the consecration in a case where the celebrant forgets to advert to the hosts which he had brought to the altar, or which he had seen brought to the altar, or in a case where he consecrated two hosts which were stuck to each other, even tho he saw only one of them. For in the first case, the previous intention perseveres, and in the second case, the word "This" certainly refers to all the hosts present.

208. NOTE. What of the consecration of hosts which are brought to the altar by an employee of the Church, but which the Celebrant *has forgotten to place upon the corporal?*

---

253. It is very evident that Communion is not to be given with hosts whose consecration is doubtful. If they are few in number, the celebrant may take them before the ablutions; if they are many, they should be kept in the tabernacle to be consecrated conditionally at another Mass, or to be permitted to become corrupted.

If the celebrant, at the moment of consecration, or even *only* at the Offertory, has noticed the hosts and *has had the intention to consecrate them,* there is no room for doubt as to their consecration; for it is only *thru error or inattention* that he has failed to comply with a precept of the Church which, after all, does not of itself affect the validity of the sacrifice. His intention, therefore, is sufficient.

However, we may hold as certain that these hosts would not be consecrated if the priest did not notice them at all. And the consecration would be *doubtful* if, while noticing the ciborium placed upon the altar, the priest formulated no intention of consecrating these hosts; the glance directed at them did not necessarily produce any such intention in his mind. For this reason, and also because of the lack of agreement amongst theologians on this point, their consecration must be regarded as doubtful, and the hosts should not be given to the faithful.

The same question arises as to the drops of wine which form on the inside of the chalice cup, and as to detached fragments of the host. We may, ordinarily, *presume* that they are not consecrated because of the lack of intention. And all authors recommend to the celebrant the practice of carefully wiping the chalice after pouring into it the matter for the sacrifice, and then formulating once for all the intention of not consecrating these separate drops of wine and these fragments of the hosts.

No. 2.—Conditions for Liceity

209. 1. It would be a grievous mortal sin, even in case of extreme necessity, to consecrate one matter without the other, or both of them outside the celebration of Mass[254] (c. 817).

2. The celebrant must follow the rules laid down by the Church; in particular he must take care not to consecrate too large a number of hosts, lest corruption take place.

3. The Church particularly demands, and that under pain of mortal sin, that the Eucharistic matter shall be placed upon the altar and also upon the corporal. It is also required (at least under pain of venial sin) that the host, the chalice, and the ciborium

254. After the elevation it is *absolutely forbidden* to consecrate other hosts. This would be renewing the Sacrifice in an incomplete fashion, against the will of the Church and of Our Lord.

shall rest, at least for the great part, upon the altarstone. But after the consecration it is permitted to push the ciborium back to give more room to the chalice. Finally, at the oblation of the host and the consecration, the ciborium must be uncovered.

It is not forbidden to consecrate hosts which are brought to the altar after the Offertory, or even, when a very grave reason is present, at the beginning of the Canon (v.g., so as not to deprive a large number of the faithful of Communion). In this case, the celebrant must first make a mental oblation of these hosts.

Article III.—The Form of the Eucharist

210. By the "form" of the Eucharist we mean the words by which Our Lord instituted this august sacrament, and which the priest repeats to effect the consecration in the name of Christ whose place he fills. These words are to be uttered by the priest, not as a recital of a past event, but with the intention of affirming what they signify, that is, the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Our Lord. To this end, it is enough that he have the intention of consecrating and doing what the Church demands.

There is a special form for the bread, and a special form for the wine. For the bread it is: *"Hoc est enim corpus meum,"* "This is My Body;" for the wine, it is: *"Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei,"* "This is the chalice of My Blood, the blood of the new and eternal testament (the mystery of faith[255]), which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins".[256]

211. In these two forms, apart from the word *"enim,"* all the words must be carefully pronounced, under pain of mortal sin. But for the consecration of the bread, only these words are essential: *"Hoc est corpus meum,"* according to all theologians; for the consecration of the wine, the words: *"Hic est calix sanguinis mei,"* according to the common and morally certain opinion (Lehmkuhl, 171). The opinion of Scotus, who regarded the words *"Qui pri-*

255. These four words are not taken from the Gospel; they are a pious ejaculation introduced by the Church, and recalling the exclamations which were uttered at that moment by the deacon or even by the faithful (Fortescue-Boudinhon, *La Messe*, p. 444).

256. The meaning of these words is clear: "What is in my hands, what is contained under these species (and which thus far was bread) is My Body," that is to say, is now, by the effect of transubstantiation, My Body; "the drink that is in this chalice (*hic* here designates the container for the thing contained) is My Blood," that is to say, the substance of the wine has been changed into My Blood, which remains alone under the species of the wine.

die" as essential, is no longer held by anyone. However, the priest must pronounce them with great care as well as the words which precede the consecration of the wine.

Any change which would destroy the essential meaning of the sacramental words would impair the validity of the consecration. If the change did not substantially modify the meaning, the consecration would be valid, but it would almost always be a mortal sin to voluntarily make such a change. However, mere carelessness in pronouncing the words (saying, for instance, *es* instead of *est, copus* instead of *corpus, calis* instead of *calix),* would be only a venial sin.

212. According to these principles, the consecration would be null and void if the priest made use of the following formulas: *"Hic* (here, the adverb) *est corpus meum, ecce corpus meum, hoc corpus meum* (the word *est* is essential to express the transubstantiation), *hic sanguis est meus, ecce sanguis meus, hoc sit sanguis meus,* etc."

It would be doubtful if the following formulas were used: *"Hoc corpus est meum, illud est corpus meum,* (however, both these formulas may have in the mind of the celebrant the meaning of the regular form), *haec est caro mea, iste est sanguis meus, hic calix sanguinis mei,* etc."

It would be a mortal sin to say: *"Hic cibus est corpus meum, hoc meum est corpus, hoc est sanguis meus;"* but the consecration in these cases would be valid.[257]

CHAPTER IX

The Liturgy of the Mass

Under this heading we shall include a number of precepts and directions regarding the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice.

Article I.—The Rite and the Quality of the Mass

213. Every priest is bound to say Mass according to the rite to which he belongs (or according to the rules of his own liturgy), either in his own country *or in a strange church*[258] (cf. n. 194).

257. The Ritual bids the priest not to be disturbed if he fears that he has omitted one of the words of consecration; if it is certain, or if he has serious reasons to think that he has omitted some essential word, he should repeat the formula, at least conditionally; if it is a question of non-essential words, he should go right on with the Mass. (Ritual, De defect., V. 2).

258. A decree of the Congregation of Rites (Feb. 24, 1890) authorizes priests of the Ambrosian rite to say Mass outside their own diocese, in the Roman rite. This decree is not to be found in the last edition of the *Decreta authentica.*

This obligation extends also to the use of the liturgical language, that is, Latin in the Occidental church, and the national tongue (which must not be confused with the vulgar tongue) for the Oriental churches. It would be a mortal sin to violate this rule without an indult.

214. As regards the quality of the Mass, on the other hand, the general rule is that the priest (diocesan or regular) shall conform to the calendar of the church or oratory where he says Mass, even for a feast which is specially conceded to that church.[259]

The word *oratory* means here not only public oratories, but also the principal chapel of a bishop's house, of a seminary, of a college, of a hospital, or of a prison; and that, even though the priest has a special calendar and is the only one to say Mass[260] (S. R. C., Dec. 9, 1895, July 27, 1896).

On the other hand, a priest who says Mass in a private oratory, or in the secondary oratory of a pious house, must follow his own calendar.

215. It would ordinarily be only a venial sin to fail from time to time to follow the *Ordo* as regards the quality of the Mass (for instance, to say a Requiem Mass on a duplex feast); and a legitimate reason, even tho not of great importance, would excuse from all sin. If, however, such changes were frequent, or were made on solemn feast days, it might be a mortal sin because of the contempt shown for the rubrics or the scandal given the faithful (Cappello, n. 830).

According to the general rubrics of the Missal, the Mass should, so far as possible, follow the office of the day. As we shall explain later, private votive Masses and private Requiem Masses are allowed on certain days, but *their celebration supposes a reasonable cause* (a motive of piety, the saying of the Mass for a dead person); and it would be an abuse on the part of the pastor to furnish the priests who are saying Mass nothing but black vestments on the pretext that Masses for the dead are allowed on that day. It would be a strange thing, indeed, if, saying Mass for the living, to ask for the cure of an illness, etc., one should say a

259. However, this prescription applies only to Masses of duplex rite or higher. When it is a question of a simple or semi-double office, the celebrant may follow his own calendar.

260. The decree applies to the oratories of all religious women (even of those of simple vows) whose Constitutions, approved by the Holy See, include the obligation of the choir (A. A. S., 1924, p. 114).

Requiem Mass under the pretext that the rite of the day does not prevent it. On the contrary, when the Mass is asked for a dead person, the Church recommends the saying of a Requiem Mass, when the rubrics permit it.

216. PRIVATE VOTIVE MASSES[261] (even when not sung) are permitted for a reasonable cause, on semi-duplex feasts, on days within a *common* octave, on the Friday which follows the octave of the Ascension, and on all offices of simple rite or of ferias which are not excepted. *These exceptions are the following:* the ferias of the Ember seasons, the ferias of Advent from the 17th to the 23d of December inclusively, the ferias of Lent, Rogation Monday, vigils, simple octaves even when a simple commemoration is made of them in the office, and the days when one says for the first time a Mass of an "impeded" Sunday.

217. In churches, public or semi-public oratories, it is allowed, on the First Friday of the month, to say a (low) votive Mass of the Sacred Heart (with *Gloria*, *Credo*, one oration, Preface of the Cross, and at the end, the Gospel according to St. John), provided that there are held in these churches with the permission of the Ordinary, exercises in honor of the Sacred Heart, before, during,

---

261. By a *votive Mass* we mean one which does not correspond with the office of the day, and which the celebrant chooses out of devotion, or for the sake of complying with the wishes of the faithful or of the Church.

This Mass may be the Mass of one of the feasts inscribed in the Roman Martyrology, or, by preference, one of the Masses listed as votive or permitted as such in the Missal (the Masses of the Holy Trinity, of the Passion and the Cross of Our Lord, of the Holy Ghost, of the Blessed Sacrament, of the Holy Name of Jesus, of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, of the Precious Blood, etc.). For the Blessed Virgin, it is allowed to take one of the five Masses which are listed in the Missal according to the time of the year, or one of the Masses (very numerous) which are permitted as votive (the Immaculate Conception, the Seven Dolors, the Most Pure Heart of Mary, etc.); but is not allowed to say a votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin on the day of one of her feasts, nor during the octave of one of her feasts, nor on the vigil of the Assumption or of the Immaculate Conception. For a votive Mass of thanksgiving, the Mass of the Holy Trinity is to be taken, or the Mass of the Holy Ghost, or the Mass of the Blessed Virgin, adding (under one conclusion) the special oration for thanksgiving.

A private votive Mass has always three orations at least: *as a general rule*, the second is the oration of the day, the third is the oration which is said in the second place in the Mass of the day. There are exceptions to this (v.g., in Masses of the Blessed Virgin, the second oration is *de Spiritu Sancto*). A low votive Mass may have five or seven orations.

At such private votive Masses the *Credo* is never said; the *Gloria* is almost always omitted, but is said in the votive Mass of the Holy Angels, in the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin when said on a Saturday, and in the Mass of a feast which is impeded by a superior office.

As for *solemn* votive Masses, they always presuppose a grave cause, referrring to the public welfare (v.g., to obtain the cessation of a pestilence, to ask for rain, for fine weather, etc.) and a special permission of the Ordinary. They must not be sung on a Sunday of the first class, or a duplex feast of the first class, or on privileged major ferias (Ash Wednesday and the first days of Holy Week), or on the vigils of Pentecost or Christmas, or on All Souls Day. They ordinarily take the *Gloria* and the *Credo*.

or after the Mass. This Mass is not permitted if on this Friday a feast of Our Lord occurs (the feast of the Presentation in the Temple included), or a duplex of the first class, a privileged feria or vigil, a privileged octave, or the feast of All Souls. In parochial churches where there is only one priest, this votive Mass may not be said if there is an obligation on this day to say the Mass *pro populo*.

218. As for private *sung* votive Masses, they may be celebrated any day except on duplex feasts, Sundays (even anticipated or transferred as to the office), and privileged ferias, vigils, or octaves.[262]

219. REQUIEM MASSES[263] may be included under Votive Masses, in this sense, that they are not in conformity with the office of the day.

Whenever private votive Masses are allowed (see above) the priest may celebrate, in their stead or instead of the Mass of the day, the *Quotidiana* Mass of the dead with or without chant, according as the votive Mass is permitted with or without chant. Moreover, this Mass (low or sung) is allowed, during Lent, on the first day of each week unless a duplex feast or a privileged feria occurs on that day.[264]

---

262. The Mass *pro sponso et sponsa* is a votive Mass, but with greater privileges as to the days when they may be celebrated.

263. The Missal contains six different Requiem Masses. The first three are said on All Souls Day (the first is also said for the repose of the soul of a Cardinal, a Bishop, or a priest with special orations for each case); the fourth is said for the general run of deaths on the day of the funeral and when the news of the death is received, and on the third, the seventh, and thirtieth day after the death or the burial with special orations; the fifth is said on anniversaries, even when they are celebrated several days before or after the day itself, or at services for all the members of a community. In other cases the sixth Mass is said (the *Missa quotidiana*).

All Ordos indicate the days on which these Masses may be said. We shall merely remark that it is forbidden to say a Requiem Mass in a church where the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament is being held (except on All Souls Day when that falls within the time of the Forty Hours Adoration; for on that day all the Masses are Requiem Masses, but not said on the altar of exposition—and violet vestments are to be used). The Requiem Mass is also forbidden in churches where there is only one priest, on February 2d, on Ash Wednesday, on Palm Sunday, on the vigil of Pentecost, of the feast of St. Mark, and on the three Rogation days if on these days the prescribed ceremonies are carried out (New Rubrics, tit. III, 12).

In a church where there are several Masses on Sundays, it is not allowed to conduct a burial at the time set for the High Mass; the Ritual always takes it for granted that the funeral shall not interfere with the divine office (tit. VI, ch. 1, n. 5).

When the Mass for the dead is forbidden, it is replaced, on days when this is allowed, by the Office of the Dead followed by the Absolution. The catafalque is taken away after this, and then the Mass of the day may be said.

264. The priest who is prevented for any reason from saying a Requiem Mass on that day, cannot use the privilege for another day that same week.

In *Missa quotidianis* three orations are said; in low Masses there may be five or seven and the oration *Fidelium* is always said in the last place. If the dead person for whom the Mass is offered is clearly specified, the first oration is that which applies

220. There are certain circumstances which likewise authorize the celebration of a low Requiem Mass, excepting always on Sundays, holydays of obligation (even suppressed), duplex feasts of the first or the second class (even transferred), and privileged ferias, vigils, and octaves.

1. The day of the solemn funeral services of a dead person in a church or public oratory, it is permitted, *in that church or oratory,* to say as many low Masses (*in die obitus*) for the dead person as may be desired. This holds good even if, for a reasonable cause, the body is not present or has already been buried.

2. In semi-public oratories which serve as churches or public oratories, it is also allowed to say these low Requiem Masses, but on one day only, as the celebrant may select, between the day of the death and the day of the burial.

3. In semi-public oratories which do not serve as churches or public oratories, and in private oratories, it is allowed to say for a dead person low Requiem Masses *(in die obitus),* every day from his death to his burial, provided that the corpse is *physically present* in the house where the oratory is located.

4. In all churches, it is allowed (excepting always the exceptions mentioned above) to say one Mass, low or sung, for a dead person, on the first day after the reception of the news of his death that is not "impeded" by a parochial obligation or even a personal obligation *(opportuniori die).* The same permission holds good for the third, the seventh, and the thirtieth day, as well as for the anniversary of the day of the death or of the day of the funeral.[265]

When these days are liturgically impeded, it is permitted to anticipate or to transfer the Mass to the first free day; but in such a case the Mass must be a sung Mass.

5. In any church or oratory (public or private) erected in a cemetery,[266] it is allowed to say the *Missa quotidiana* of the dead

to him, the second is left to the choice of the celebrant, and the third is the oration *Fidelium* for all the departed. If the Mass is asked for in a general manner for the dead members of a family or association, the first oration is *Deus veniae largitor,* the second *ad libitum,* and the third *Fidelium.* Finally, if the Mass is for the souls in Purgatory in general, the celebrant will say, without any change, the prayers assigned to the *Missa quotidiana.*

265. In these different circumstances the Requiem Mass is said with only one oration. The *Dies Irae* is obligatory.

266. This privilege does not concern churches in which the dead are buried and which are not erected in a cemetery; nor capitular, collegial, or parish churches which are surrounded by a cemetery.

(with three orations) every day (with the same exceptions as above), provided that the cemetery is still used as a place of burial[267] (cf. New Rubrics, tit. III).

221. NOTE. Outside the month of November, Advent, Lent, and the Paschal time, the first day of each month on which a ferial office occurs, there is inserted, before the last oration of the Mass, the oration *Fidelium* for the dead, without, however, omitting any of the orations assigned for that day. Outside of Lent and the Paschal season, the same rule is observed on the Monday of each week when the ferial office is celebrated, provided that there is not, on that day, the office of a vigil or the obligation of saying the Mass of an impeded Sunday.

222. MORE AMPLE INDULTS.—Apart from these general rules concerning votive and requiem Masses, Bishops ordinarily receive from the Holy See indults[268] to authorize such of their priests as have poor sight to say *at any time* the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin, and on days when they are allowed, Masses of Requiem. The Congregation of Rites has set forth (Jan. 12, 1921) the conditions under which these concessions are granted. The priest is urged to say Mass, so far as possible, in a private oratory, or, if he celebrates in a public church, to select an hour when there shall be fewest people present. Moreover, when the indult specifies that the beneficiaries must not be totally blind, it cannot be accorded to those who have entirely lost their sight; these latter must have a special permission; and the Holy See requires that they shall be always assisted by another priest when they say Mass.[269]

---

267. Let us remark that when the family cannot pay the expense of a *Missa cantata*, the low Mass for the funeral of a poor person enjoys the same privileges as the *Missa cantata* so far as the days when it may be celebrated are concerned. Unless, however, permission has been obtained from the Ordinary, the Mass of the day must not be omitted on Sundays and holydays of obligation.

268. Let us also call attention to the indult which most dioceses possess, and which allows the *singing* of Requiem *Missae quotidianae* on three days in the week, even when the office is of the double rite. If, therefore, the other days are of the simple or the semi-double rite, there is nothing to prevent singing Masses for the dead on every day of the week; on the other hand, if all the days are of the double rite, there is no ground for exceeding the limits of the indult.

Moreover, this privilege does not apply to doubles of the first or of the second class, or to holydays of obligation, or to Ash Wednesday, or to the first three days of Holy Week, or to the vigils of Christmas, Epiphany, and Pentecost, or to the octaves of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, and Corpus Christi.

269. The instruction of the Congregation of Rites sets forth the regulations concerning the celebration of the Mass:

1:—*For the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin*, the priest may, if his sight is good enough, say that which is special for the liturgical season in which he actually finds himself; but he may, at any season, say the fifth, that is, the one proper to the time

Article II.—The Rubrics

223. By the rubrics we mean the rules established by the Church to regulate the rites and ceremonies which the celebrant must observe. They comprize whatever tends to make the celebration of Mass dignified and pious, that is, the use of sacred objects, the prayers and the movements of the priest. They are general and particular; the former are found in the front part of the Missal; the latter, are printed in red characters in the body of the book.

224. It is not easy to determine the *degree of obligation* of the rubrics. According to certain authors, especially those who are liturgists, all the rubrics of the Missal are preceptive, and consequently bind under pain of mortal or venial sin.

This opinion is by no means the common opinion. The doctrine advanced by St. Alphonsus Liguori and followed by a large number of theologians may be summed up as follows: there are rubrics which are preceptive, and others which are directive. The former convey an obligation; the latter give advice concerning the devout celebration of the Mass.

225. Among the preceptive rubrics, must be classed, in a general way,[270] all those which regulate the order of the Mass; they bind under pain of mortal sin or venial sin according to their object.

---

between Pentecost and Advent;—except on the last three days of Holy Week, he *may* say the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin at any time, even on the most solemn feasts, and he *must* say it on days when the Ordo does not permit the Mass for the dead;—on Christmas day he may say this Mass three times.

Special Rubrics: The *Gloria* must be said whenever the Ordo requires it for the Mass of the day, during the octaves, even simple octaves, of feasts of the Blessed Virgin, on Saturdays, and on the jubilee of the celebrant's ordination to the priesthood.

There is only one oration when the Mass of the day excludes the orations of the season, or when that Mass is celebrated for a grave and public cause; otherwise there are three orations; the second, *de Spiritu Sancto;* the third, *pro Ecclesia* or *pro Papa.*

The *Credo* is said whenever the Mass of the day demands it; when the votive Mass is said *pro re gravi,* and on the jubilee of the celebrant's ordination to the priesthood.

At the Preface the priest says *Et te in veneratione,* except on the feasts and during the octaves of the Blessed Virgin which have a separate form.

The last Gospel is always the Gospel of St. John, *In principio.*

2:—*For Requiem Masses,* chanted or not, they may be said in the stead of the Mass *de Beata,* whenever the rubrics permit the Mass for the dead. The indultarian will always take the Missa *quotidiana;* on All Souls Day he may say this Mass twice or thrice, with only the one oration *Fidelium.*

This Mass has only one oration whenever the Requiem Mass that it replaces has only one oration; otherwise three orations are said, and the priest may change the first and the third.

The *Dies Irae* is never of obligation for the indultarian; but if the Mass is sung, the choir must not fail to sing this Sequence.

270. Even amongst the rubrics which are to observed *intra Missam,* it would seem that not all of them oblige in conscience.

A probable opinion says that some few of them are merely directive; these are the doctrinal instructions which are of no more importance than the doctrine which they recall; the decree of Pious V and Canon 818 must be taken in a very general sense.

Pius V, when he published the Roman Missal, had already made it obligatory to carefully follow the rules concerning the chant and the reading of the prayers of the Mass, as well as the ceremonies of the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. The *Codex* renews this command; it censures every contrary custom, and commands the celebrant to follow with the utmost care and the greatest piety the rubrics of the Ritual, and to take care not to introduce into the liturgy of the ceremonies or the prayers anything of his own (c. 818).

As to the rubrics which refer to what is to be done *before or after the Mass,* most authors regard them as simply directive. For the decree of Pius V and Canon 818 speak only of the ceremonies and the prayers of the celebration of the Mass.

This, however, does not mean that there cannot easily be a venial sin in violating these directive rubrics, if the violation comes from lack of respect for the directions of the Church.

226. The same rule may be followed in deciding as to the degree of obligation of the decrees of the Congregation of Rites.

Except when the terms used, or the grave importance of the thing prescribed, make it unmistakable, we are free to regard as preceptive the decrees which refer to the Mass itself, and as directive those which concern the preparation for Mass and the thanksgiving after Mass.

227. As regards the seriousness of the sin, it is in proportion to the material derogation from the rule, or to the excellence of the rite which has been neglected, or to the nature of the law, divine or human, which is violated.

We shall briefly consider those violations which may be more frequently committed, and try to determine their gravity.

228. SINS OF OMISSION.—In a general manner, every voluntary omission, without a legitimate motive, of a ceremony or prayer in the Mass, is a sin.

This sin is ordinarily a mortal sin when it is a question of a prayer or ceremony which is repeated in every Mass, *especially if it is a part of the Canon.* It is venial when it is a question of a prayer or a rite which is not always prescribed by the liturgy.

By means of this general rule, we may give the following decisions:

1. *As regards the prayers,* we may generally consider as a mortal sin the omission of all the prayers at the foot of the altar,

the omission of the Epistle and the prayers which follow it, the omission of the Gospel, the omission of the orations of the feast of the day (collect, secret, and post-communion), the omission of most of the prayers between the Offertory and the Canon, the omission of any prayers of the Canon which has a complete meaning of its own, the omission of the *Pater* or of the prayers which precede the Communion.

On the other hand, it would be only a venial sin to omit the *Gloria* or the *Credo,* or a sequence, or one of the orations of the day, or the commemorations, or one of the prayers which precede the Canon or the Communion, the Tract or the Gradual, the last Gospel, the Lessons special to the Masses of the Ember seasons, the prayers prescribed after Mass.[271]

A reasonable motive would excuse these last omissions from all sin, even venial; serious fatigue or a sudden illness would be a reason sufficient to justify the omission of a sequence or of the Lessons of the Ember season.[272]

2. *As regards the actions:* it would be a mortal sin to neglect to mix a little water with the wine (before the consecration); to omit the breaking of the Host and the mixture of the Species, since these rites have a deep mystical meaning; to neglect to purify the chalice and the paten; to omit a certain number of blessings, genuflections, inclinations, or signs of the cross.

Any other omission would be only a venial sin, v.g., to omit one or two blessings or genuflections, to purify the chalice with water, alone, or the fingers with wine alone. Reputable authors do not regard it as a sin to purify the fingers with water alone. It is

---

271. These prayers, prescribed by Leo XIII and his successors, are always obligatory, in Latin or in the vulgar tongue, after low Masses. They *may* be omitted after Masses which are immediately followed by a pious exercise (Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, or the services of a Confraternity), and after Masses which are vested with a certain amount of solemnity (conventual low Masses, Masses of ordination, of the consecration of a Bishop, the votive Mass of the Sacred Heart on the First Friday of the month, marriage Masses, Masses followed by an Absolution, etc.); they are not to be omitted because of Communions to be given after the Mass—in that case, the prayers are to be said first, and the Communions given afterwards.

When several Masses are said, these prayers are said every time the priest leaves the altar to go to the sacristy.

272. When an omission is noticed, the course to be pursued varies with the nature of the omission; if it is a question of an essential prayer (v.g., the words of consecration) it is necessary to remedy the omission by repeating them; if it is a detail of no importance, no attention is to be paid to the omission; if it is an important prayer or action, it is to be repeated if the error is of recent commission and if the repetition will not cause astonishment in the faithful. In practice, it is well not to repeat, out of their proper order, the *Gloria,* the *Credo,* and other prayers of this kind, nor the Epistle or Gospel when the Epistle or Gospel of another feast has been said. The same holds good for the Preface, the *Communicantes,* etc.

certain that a very trifling cause is enough to justify this practice from time to time, v.g., the scarcity of wine, or the nausea which it causes in the celebrant, or even, as St. Alphonsus says, the wish to avoid staining the purificator with red wine.[273]

However, when it is a question of a permanent cause, it is necessary, regularly, to secure an apostolic indult in order to be permitted to use only water or only wine.

229. By virtue of the principles set forth above (n. 225), we may hold that there is no sin in neglecting to wash the hands before or after the Mass (on condition, of course, that they are clean); in neglecting to say, before and after Mass, the prayers marked in the Missal and the Breviary for the preparation and the thanksgiving of the celebrant (cf., however, n. 96); in omitting, while putting on the vestments, the prayers which express their symbolism (cf. Lehmkuhl, 327).

230. When, because of infirmity, the celebrant is not able to observe exactly all the liturgical rites, v.g., if he is compelled to lean upon a cane, or to hold on to the altar with his hands, if he can only sketchily indicate the genuflections, etc.), he nevertheless retains the right to say Mass, even in public, provided that the faithful are not scandalized.[274]

In case the external defect is too considerable or too evident (v.g., if the priest needed somebody else to hold him up, or could say Mass only when sitting in a chair), he must have an indult from the Holy See to justify him in saying Mass.

231. Among the sins of omission may be classed *undue haste in saying Mass.* The Church, it is true, has not specified exactly the duration of the Holy Sacrifice, but all authors say that it is impossible to say Mass with the attention it requires in less than twenty minutes; and most of them, following St. Alphonsus

273. To mutilate or invert words would be a sin more or less grave according to the importance of the words, the scandal given to the faithful, or the negligence of the celebrant; but certain alterations, springing from a natural defect, are not sinful.

Genicot (n. 251, III) rightly says that these minute determinations of culpability have an importance that is more theoretical than practical. The priest does not intentionally omit an important part of the Mass; his omissions are, for the most part, the result of a negligence, more or less sinful, which will determine the gravity of the offense.

The same holds good regarding distractions during the celebration of the Mass. Any distraction that is *voluntary* and without a just cause is sinful; it would be a mortal sin if it were to be prolonged for a certain length of time during the Canon, and especially at the moment of the consecration.

274. If the celebrant could not perform the elevation of the Host and of the chalice, he would do well to abstain from saying Mass in public, except in case of necessity.

Liguori teach that the priest who says Mass in less than a quarter of an hour cannot be excused from *mortal* sin, because of the lack of respect for the Blessed Sacrament, and because of the scandal given the faithful.

In practice, follow this rule: never less than twenty minutes, even for the shortest Masses; and, when one says Mass *in public,* never more than thirty-five minutes for an ordinary low Mass. This much time is needed to say the prayers and perform the ceremonies properly; but if more time is taken, there is danger of wearying the congregation (Lehmkuhl, 302).

232. SINS OF ADDITION.—Canon 818 expressly forbids the addition of anything to the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass.

This might be a mortal sin if one were endeavoring in this way to introduce some new rite, or if the prayers added were in notable quantity and derived from sources outside the Missal.

On the other hand, it would be only a venial sin to add a *Gloria,* a *Credo,* one or more orations from the Missal, a blessing, a genuflection, etc. Nevertheless, even the good intention of the celebrant would not excuse this violation of the law.[275]

233. RULES REGARDING THE TONE OF VOICE.—There are two tones of voice prescribed by the rubrics; the ordinary conversational tone *(clara et mediocris),* and the low tone *(secreta)* (Rubr. Gen., part I, tit. 16, n. 2).

The prayers which are to be said in a loud voice must be pronounced distinctly, neither too fast nor too slowly, not loud enough to disturb other priests who may be saying Mass, and yet loud enough to permit those who are assisting at the Mass to hear and understand them.

The prayers to be recited in a low voice are to be audible to the celebrant and not to the assistants.

234. From these principles theologians have deduced the following conclusions:

1. It would be a mortal sin to pronounce the words of consecration so softly that the celebrant himself cannot hear them. In such a case, there would be reason to fear that the form of the

275. It would surely be no sin to utter a few ejaculatory prayers, or to formulate a few mental prayers at moments when they would not interfere with the liturgical order of the Mass, for instance, at the moment of the elevation, during the incensing, during the genuflections, etc.

sacrament was not pronounced in a sensible manner, and that consequently the sacrament was invalid.

Again, it might be a mortal sin to read in a *very loud* tone a notable portion of the Canon, both because of the disrespect shown for the rubrics, and because of the scandal given the faithful (this case is not at all probable).

2. It would be a venial sin if, thru the negligence of the priest, the faithful were to hear nothing of those portions of the Mass which are to be said aloud, or if they were able to follow the secret portions, or if the celebrant could not hear himself. However, in this matter, all exaggerated fears and scruples are to be avoided.[276]

Article III.—The Continuity of the Mass

235. The sacrifice of the Mass must always be complete; and as a general rule, it must be celebrated without interruption.

It would be a grievous mortal sin not to continue the Mass after the consecration of the bread; for the consecration of the two species is required, according to the common opinion, for the essence of the sacrifice. One might do this to escape the danger of imminent death, or to avoid the profanation of the Holy Eucharist.[277]

On the other hand, before the Offertory, it would be only a venial sin to discontinue the Mass,[278] or to interrupt it for a short space of time (less than an hour); for this a reasonable motive is sufficient, for instance, fatigue on the part of the priest, a sermon to be preached, or the banns of marriage to be announced.

236. From the Offertory to the Consecration, a truly grave cause is required to discontinue the Mass, or to interrupt it during any considerable length of time.

276. Any legitimate excuse is sufficient to reassure the priest; a weariness of the throat, the presence of other celebrants in the neighboring chapels, etc.; when the church is large and the crowds considerable, it is not necessary that he be heard by everybody. In like manner he must not bother about whether the server hears him.

277. In this case the priest may immediately consume the consecrated host, or take it away with the chalice, to complete the Sacrifice elsewhere. If the consecration of the wine has been accomplished, it would be better to consume the Sacred Species.

278. Before the Offertory, the priest might stop and commence the Mass over again, in order to enable an important personage or a group of the faithful to assist at the Holy Sacrifice, or, again, if he learned that the priest who was to say the principal Mass was prevented from doing so.

On the contrary, it is not proper to interrupt the Mass after the Gospel for the purpose of taking up a collection. During a *Missa cantata,* if a collection is prescribed, and cannot be put off to another moment, the celebrant may take it up during the singing of the *Credo.*

Thus, for instance, a priest might *discontinue* the Mass if he felt suddenly and seriously indisposed, if he recalled to mind at that moment that he was not fasting or that he was not in the state of grace, or that he was under a censure,[279] or if an excommunicated *vitandus* refused to leave the church.[280]

So, too, the priest could *interrupt* the Mass either for a personal reason (a sudden indisposition), or to attend to some urgent ministry (baptism or absolution to be given to a dying person). On his return he should begin where he left off, if the interruption lasts for less than an hour; otherwise, he will begin the Mass at the beginning, and, where the oblation had already been made, the celebrant will put the matter aside, and consume it with the ablutions.

237. After the consecration, it is not permitted to *interrupt* the Mass except for a very grave reason, for instance, sudden fatigue, the necessity of giving a dying person baptism, absolution, or (in default of the sacrament of Penance) Extreme Unction. In this case, the priest should put the Blessed Sacrament in a secure place, preferably in the tabernacle. On his return, he will resume the Mass at the place where he left off, no matter how long his absence may have lasted.[281]

238. When, because of a serious indisposition, the priest has had to interrupt the Mass after the consecration of the bread and before the Communion,[282] he is under serious obligation to complete the sacrifice.

This obligation binds the celebrant if he is able to continue the Mass after a short rest, even if he is no longer fasting, and even though another priest who is fasting is present.

But if the fatigue continues, the obligation then falls on any other priest that may be available, even if he is no longer fasting, and even if he is under a censure or is irregular.

Those who are present when the celebrant is compelled to inter-

---

279. However, all scandal must be avoided, which is hardly possible during public services.

280. In this latter case, if the Canon has been begun, the priest may continue the Mass until the Communion, after having bidden the faithful to leave the church.

281. Between the Communion of the priest and the Communion of the faithful, it is sometimes permitted to interrupt the Mass, either for the purpose of addressing an exhortation to the congregation on certain occasions (a First Communion, or a General Communion), or to permit the renewal of religious vows.

282. If this accident happens before the consecration or after the Communion under the species of wine, no attention should be paid to this ruling.

rupt the Mass, must make every effort to find such a priest.[283] This priest will take up the Mass at the point where it was interrupted; at the Communion (if the sick priest is able to receive Communion), he will divide the Host in two parts,[284] will give one to the sick priest, and consume the other himself.

The priest who has thus completed the sacrifice may not say another Mass, even tho he has refrained from taking the ablutions.[285] However, on Christmas day and on All Souls Day if he is still fasting, he may celebrate two other Masses.

NOTE. THE RUBRIC "DE DEFECTIBUS."—We believe that we have pointed out, as occasion offered, most of the cases contemplated by the rubric *de defectibus* concerning the matter, the form, and the person of the minister of the Eucharist.

We shall now give a brief resume of certain of them that are most useful to know, or which we have overlooked:

1. When the priest perceives that the matter (bread or wine) is not valid, he must replace it by valid matter:

a. If he notices it at any time between the offertory and the consecration, he has only to take other matter, make a *mental* oblation, and go on with the interrupted prayers.

b. Between the consecration and the Communion, he should make a mental oblation, recite the formula of consecration beginning with *Qui pridie* or *Simili modo,* according as it is a question of the matter of the bread or of the wine, and, when the consecration is finished, continue from where he left off.

In both these cases, the first oblation must be put one side and consumed by the celebrant after the Precious Blood.

c. If, on receiving Communion, the celebrant notices that the matter of the bread was not valid, he takes another host, makes a mental oblation of it, recites the formula of consecration beginning with *Qui pridie,* and consumes it at once.

283. After an hour or two of search, this obligation ceases. However, even tho several hours have elapsed, the substitute priest may continue the Mass.

284. When there are other hosts, consecrated either at this Mass or at another Mass, the celebrant should give one of these to the sick man, and keep the whole large host for himself.

The common opinion, according to Gury (II, n. 303), is that Communion should be given to the sick man, even if he has been already taken out of the church.

285. On Good Friday, if the celebrant falls sick, the deacon of the Mass may finish the ceremony if he is a priest and is fasting. But, as the Mass of the Presanctified is not a true sacrifice, if there was no priest at hand who was *fasting,* there would be nothing to do but to put the consecrated Host away with the Reserved Sacrament; on the morrow, the celebrant would consume it after taking the Precious Blood.

In the practically impossible case where he would not notice this until after consuming the Precious Blood, he would consecrate both matters over again and repeat the whole formula of consecration.

d. If, when consuming the species of the wine, the priest notices that the chalice contains only water, or vinegar, or corrupted wine, he must take *another host,* again put wine and water in the chalice, make a mental oblation, and repeat the whole formula of consecration beginning with *Qui pridie.* However, if he was afraid of provoking the curiosity or the scandal of the faithful, the rubric authorizes him to omit the consecration of the bread.

It may happen, when one perceives the invalidity of one matter after the other is consecrated, that it is impossible to procure bread or wine. After doing everything possible to procure the means to complete the sacrifice, the priest must continue and finish the Mass, omitting the words and the rites which relate to the species which is defective.

2. When an insect or a repulsive object falls into the chalice *before the consecration,* the wine should be poured into a decent place, and the oblation made of other wine.

If this takes place *after the consecration,* the celebrant should remove the insect or the object, wash it with wine, and, when Mass is over, burn it and throw the ashes and the wine into the *piscina.* If the object would not cause nausea, it is better to consume it together with the Precious Blood.

3. If, after the consecration, any poison or any substance which is apt to provoke vomiting, should fall into the chalice, the Precious Blood is to be put aside, and other wine consecrated. When the Mass is over, the Precious Blood is poured upon cloth or tow which is to be kept in the tabernacle until the species of wine has dried up; then it is burnt and the ashes thrown into the *piscina.*

In like manner, a poisoned host is to be preserved until it becomes corrupted; the debris will then be thrown into the *piscina.*

4. If, through neglect or from some other cause, it happens that a portion of the host falls into the chalice, no change is to be made in the rites of Holy Mass; the celebrant will perform, if possible, all the ceremonies with the rest of the host.

In case the whole host falls into the Precious Blood, the priest will continue the Mass, pronouncing all the words, but omitting

the ceremonies which relate to the host; he will receive the Body and Blood together, saying: *"Corpus et Sanguis D. N. J. C."*

5. When the Precious Blood freezes in the chalice, it is liquefied by wrapping the chalice with warm cloths, or, if necessary, by immersing the chalice as far as the cup in warm water, not on the altar itself, but quite near by, taking care, of course, that no water shall enter the chalice.

6. In cases when, through negligence, a little of the Precious Blood falls on the ground, or on the altarstone, the corporal, the altarcloths, or the clothing of the priest, it must be taken up at once with the lips; then the spot where the Precious Blood fell must be carefully washed, the ablution gathered up in a chalice, and thrown into the *piscina.*

When, after such an accident, a little of the Precious Blood remains in the chalice, the Mass is to be continued. If all the Precious Blood was spilled, the celebrant must consecrate wine and water over again, beginning with *Simili modo,* after making a mental oblation.

7. If the host falls to the ground, or on a carpet, an altarcloth, or the clothing, the spot where it fell is to be carefully washed, and the ablution thrown into the *piscina.*

PART SECOND
The Sacrament of the Eucharist

CHAPTER I

The Nature and Effects of This Sacrament

Article 1.—The Nature of This Sacrament

239. 1. The Holy Eucharist, as the Council of Trent teaches (Sess. VII, c. 1; Sess. XIII, c. 1 and 2), is a sacrament of the New Law which, under the species of bread and wine, contains truly, really, and substantially the body and blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, for the spiritual nourishment of our souls.

For the Eucharist contains external and visible signs; grace is both typified and produced in it; and we know, from the Scriptures, that Jesus is its author. These are reasons enough to assert that it is a sacrament, as theologians prove in detail.

However, this sacrament has characteristics which are peculiar to it. The Holy Eucharist contains not merely grace, but the Author of grace; it is a permanent sacrament while the other sacraments exist only at the moment when they are administered; and finally, while in the other sacraments the matter is merely modified, in the Eucharist the bread and the wine are changed into the very substance of the body and blood of Our Lord (Cat. of the Council of Trent, ch. xviii, No. 2).

2. From the fact that the matter of the Eucharist consists of bread and wine, we must not therefore conclude that the sacrament is double. For both these elements have the same signification. They symbolize the perfect spiritual nourishment of the Christian; there cannot be two sacraments, therefore, since only one thing is signified. "Food and drink are two different things, but they serve only one end, which is to restore the strength of the body. It was proper, then, to institute this sacrament with two different matters, which produce effects of the same nature, to represent the

spiritual aliment which sustains our souls and restores our strength" (Cat., *loc. cit.*).

It follows from this that, in order to be specifically complete, the Eucharistic sacrament *(in ratione signi)* supposes both the species of bread and the species of wine, altho one single species produces all the effects of the sacrament.

3. It is likewise a truth of faith (Sess., XIII, c. 3) that Our Lord is whole and entire, both under the species of bread and under the species of wine, and that He is whole and entire under the smallest particles of each species.

It is also a most certain doctrine altho not defined, that even before any separation or division, Our Lord is whole and entire under each part of each species.

St. Thomas explains this by saying that the Body of Our Lord is present under the species *as a substance is under its dimensions;*[286] the substance of bread, for instance, is whole and entire under each fragment of the bread, either when the particles are divided, or when they are merely divisible. "And since the Body of Our Lord replaces the substance of the bread in the Eucharist, it is plain that it is in the sacrament in the same manner as the substance of the bread was before the consecration" (Cat. of the Council of Trent, XIX, No. 4).

However, before the division of the species, Christ is present *only once* under each species; after the division, he is present as many times as there are particles.[287] Just how far this division of the species may be carried, and still safeguard the Real Presence, it is difficult to say; but it must be admitted as a truth of faith that a particle contains Our Lord so long as it is perceptible by our senses and retains the appearance of bread or wine.

4. Once transubstantiation has taken place, only one thing can bring about the cessation of the Presence of Our Lord;[289] namely, the total corruption of the sacramental species, such a corruption

---

286. The presence of Our Lord in the Holy Eucharist is analogous to the presence of the soul in the body. For the soul is whole and entire in the whole body and in each of its parts.

287. In a piece of bread, even of large dimensions, the *substance* of bread is present only once; if it is divided, it is whole and entire under each portion. So is it with the Body of Our Lord, since it is present in the Eucharist just as the substance is in the dimensions.

289. The Church condemns those who hold that the Real Presence ceases when the Host is exposed to profanation, when it is cast into a sewer, or eaten by animals; none of these acts, of itself, destroys the substance of bread.

as would make them incapable of containing the substance of bread and wine. Consequently the Body and the Blood of Our Lord would give way to that substance which would have succeeded the bread and wine in the same condition of change.[290]

The reason for this is clear; corrupted bread is no longer bread, corrupted wine is no longer wine. Both of them, therefore, can no longer serve for the nourishment of the soul; and without this signification, there can be no sacrament.

From this principle we must conclude that the mixture of the consecrated wine with any other liquid which is capable of completely destroying the substance of the wine[291] (by corruption or by alteration) entails the cessation of the Real Presence. As we well know, a few drops of sulphuric acid, or a small quantity of alcohol, are enough to change the substance of wine, while one might add to a very strong wine an almost equal quantity of water without changing its nature.

Article II.—The Effects of the Eucharist

240. "The blessings and the advantages derived from the Eucharist are almost infinite," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent; "the longest and most eloquent discourse could not explain them in detail." If we compare its effects with the effects of the other sacraments, we may say in a general manner, that "the Eucharist is like the source, while the other sacraments are like the streams that flow from that source. For it contains Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the source of all heavenly gifts, the author of all the sacraments" (ch. xx, No. 1).

241. All the sacraments have as their effect the giving of sanctifying grace, or the increasing of that grace, and hence the uniting us intimately with God, considered as our supernatural end. But at the same time, they give us a special assistance (the sacramental

290. The alteration of the sacramental species produces in them dispositions to a new substantial form; when these dispositions are such that they demand the generation of a new substance, God intervenes, and by his omnipotence restores the matter necessary to the substantial change that is taking place. The disappearance of the dimensive quantity *of the bread* carries with it the cessation of the sacramental presence of the Body of Christ. Hence it is not surprising that the corruption of the sacred species is followed by all the chemical and physiological phenomena that result from the corruption of bread.

291. It is very commonly admitted that the mixture of wine with the consecrated wine does not destroy the Real Presence of Our Lord. For its mixture is not of a nature to destroy the substance of the wine.

grace) to help us to realize the particular end for which Our Lord instituted each sacrament. This sacramental grace in the Holy Eucharist consists in the increase and the preservation of supernatural life *by means of an intimate union with Christ and His mystical Body*. "We are one body," says St. Paul, "all that partake of one bread." I Cor. 10/17.

We are all called to belong to this mystical body; and the bonds which attach us to Christ are faith, hope, and charity. To maintain and to perfect this union, which is the spiritual life of our souls, Our Lord has instituted the spiritual food of the Eucharist, which is analogous to that material food which preserves, restores, and increases the life of the body. "Those who partake of this sacrament," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, (XX, No. 1), "receive the Son of God and are thus in a manner engrafted upon His Body as living members."

The words of St. Thomas express this special effect of the Eucharist. "It is a progressive transformation into Christ, *conversio in Christum*."—And before him, St. Augustine put these words in the mouth of Our Lord: "I am the food of grown men; grow, and you will eat me. And you will not change me into yourselves, as you do the food of your bodies; but it is you who will be changed into Me" (Conf., l. III, ch. x).

242. As to the special effects of this sacrament, they flow from its very nature, and from the end which Our Lord had in view in instituting it.

1. *The Eucharist remits venial sins.*—"There is no room for doubt," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that the Eucharist remits venial sins. All that the soul, led astray by the ardor of concupiscence, has lost by committing slight faults, this sacrament restores by blotting out those sins" (XX, No. 1). According to the teaching of very many theologians, it is a question here of direct remission *ex opere operato*, provided that the person receiving Communion does not prevent this result by a formal adhesion to sin, that is, provided that by at least the beginning of attrition he makes possible the infusion of grace. For venial sin is an obstacle to the perfect union with Christ by charity, a union which is, as we have seen, the direct purpose of the Eucharist; consequently this union must do away with all that is opposed to the fervor of charity.

This does not mean, of course, that this remission of venial sins

is not also obtained in an indirect manner, *ex opere operantis,* by means of acts of contrition and of charity which the presence of Christ excites in our hearts, and whose efficacy is in proportion to our fervor.

The Eucharist likewise remits or diminishes the temporal punishment due to these sins. This is a consequence either of the direct remission of venial sin, to which is attached a certain remission of the corresponding punishment, or of the acts of love of God inspired by the sacrament, and which obtain for us the grace of forgiveness.

243. 2. The Eucharist preserves us from mortal sin.—The Eucharist is the bread of life; it was instituted by Our Lord to preserve from death those who are nourished with it, to preserve and increase our spiritual life; it is therefore, as the Council of Trent says (XIII, c. 1), "the antidote which preserves us from mortal sin." It is the heavenly food which restores the strength of the soul, and makes it less susceptible to temptation; it is the sign of the passion of Christ, which puts the devil to flight; it obtains for the soul light and grace which fill it with a horror for sin.

Moreover, it checks and moderates the ardor of the desires of the flesh. By the very fact that it increases in the hearts of men the fire of the love of God, it necessarily extinguishes the fire of concupiscence (Catechism, XX, No. 1). Many theologians teach that the Eucharist acts *directly* on our concupiscence to check and diminish it, for its purpose is to unite us intimately with Christ, to put us in harmony with him; and this requires the weakening[202] of the movements of the flesh which are incompatible with this intimacy.

244. 3. The Eucharist enriches the soul with all virtues.—At the same time that He makes us share more abundantly in His divine life, Our Lord, by means of this sacrament, augments all the elements of the supernatural life of our souls, and bestows upon us without measure the treasure of His graces. Thus creatures receive the spirit of prayer, the spirit of sacrifice, the spirit of submission to the will of God, *a more delicate charity for their neighbors,* a greater and more ardent longing for Communion, which makes them despise all the things of earth, in a word, all

202. The Eucharist, however, unless by a quite singular favor, does not completely extinguish concupiscence, which is, at root, nothing but the natural inclination to sensible things; but it does give us precious graces to help us to avoid the acts which nature prompts us to commit against the law of God.

the virtues which are called for by the perfect union with Christ by charity.

245. 4. *The Eucharist is the source of joy.*—This is the constant teaching of Tradition and it is a consequence of the analogy that exists between the Eucharist and the food of the body which produces comfort and wellbeing in the whole organism. The ardent and active charity produced in the soul by Communion disposes us to love still more, to increase in the love of God and never to abandon Him, and this fervor is a source of joy which lessens the attractiveness of temptation; it drives away sadness and discouragement, it enables us to experience supernatural gladness and it enebriates us with the suave sweetness of God's goodness.[293] If we consider only the nature of the sacrament, this effect is infallible, but it may be impeded by distractions or preoccupations on the part of him who receives Communion.

At times this joy of the soul makes itself felt even in our senses; but this effect is not infallible, even when the dispositions of him who receives Communion are most excellent.

246. 5. *The Eucharist is the pledge of eternal life,* both for the soul and for the body. "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood," said Our Lord, "hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up on the last day." This means that the communicant acquires a new right to a glorious resurrection, without, however, being dispensed from the obligation of persevering in the state of grace until death.

This right to everlasting life comes from the fact that it is the consummation, the perfection of that union with Christ which is begun on earth by means of Holy Communion. For the Eucharist is the spiritual nourishment which gives the Christian his perfect development.

Moreover, when our flesh comes in contact with the sacred flesh of Christ, it partakes in some degree of His glorious qualities. He is the model which we must reproduce, and it is the Eucharist which, if we die in the friendship of God, will transform our body into the image of the risen body of Jesus.

247. We need analyze no further the marvelous fruits of the Eucharist; that is the special object of Dogmatic or ascetical

293. "Tho all the world were to forswear Christ," says Ozanam, "there is, in the inexpressible sweetness of a Communion and in the tears which it causes to flow, a power of conviction that would compel me to embrace the cross and to defy the unbelief of the whole world."

theology. But what we have already said will suffice to demonstrate the truth of the words of St. Thomas, adopted later on by the Council of Florence: "All the effects which corporal food can produce, such as sustaining life and increasing it, restoring strength, producing health in the whole organism, all these effects the Blessed Sacrament produces in the spiritual life, because it is the food of the spirit." (P. IIIa, q. 79, a. 3).

"In very truth," says P. Tesnière (*Somme Euch. t. II, 9me Conf.*), "Communion has only one characteristic and produces only one effect, supernatural life. But this life is composed of so many elements, so many virtues, so many graces, it can soar so high, touching upon life eternal, that, to properly describe this one effect of life eternal, one would have to divide and subdivide its extraordinary richness and treat each of the elements of this wondrous life as a separate and distinct effect of Holy Communion."

248. NOTE.—Can the fruits of Holy Communion be transferred to others? No! The Holy Eucharist is a food, and food is directly useful only to him who takes it. Nevertheless the Church does not forbid, it rather urges the faithful to offer up Communions for the living and the dead. For in itself, Communion is an act of religion that is most pleasing to God, and which we can perform in order to dispose His heart favorably toward some soul that is dear to us, and thus obtain grace for that soul. Moreover, the prayers that we offer for the same intentions, before and especially after Communion, will have a particular efficacy, because of the intimate union which Communion brings about between God and us.

CHAPTER II

The Minister of the Sacrament

We have already seen that the priest alone can *validly consecrate* the Holy Eucharist. It remains for us now to consider the rules pertaining to the *licit distribution* of the sacrament.

Article I.—The Ordinary Minister

249. The priest alone is the ordinary minister of the Eucharist; he continues the role of Christ who, after consecrating, distributed the divine food to the apostles. This is a very important part of his mission, since he is placed between God and men to convey heavenly gifts to humanity.

However, the administration of the sacraments, being one of the principal means of sanctification, belongs *jure proprio* to those who have charge of souls. Therefore, in order to give Communion, it is necessary to have not only the power of orders, but also the power of jurisdiction, that is to say, the minister of Communion must have either charge of souls, or the permission of him who has the charge of souls (Sovereign Pontiff, Bishop, or pastor); the rector of any church may also give this permission (c. 846, No. 2).

In case of necessity, a priest does not need to secure any authorization to give Communion to the faithful. At ordinary times, even in a strange church, he may presume the permission of the rector.[294] And finally, when a priest celebrates Mass, the *Codex* expressly gives him the right to administer Communion (c. 846, 31). The right to give Holy Communion is, in a manner, correlative with the right to say Mass, and as it comes from the supreme authority, it can not be suppressed or restrained by any inferior authority. The *Codex* recognizes only one exception: in a private oratory, for a just cause, and in a particular instance,[295] the Ordinary may interdict the distribution of Holy Communion (c. 869).

250. According to these general provisions of the law, a priest may, at private Masses, distribute the Holy Eucharist, not only at the Communion, but also at the beginning and at the end of Mass. At solemn Masses, only at the Communion (c. 846, No. 1).

The general terms of this canon suppress the exception formulated by the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Nov. 28, 1902), according to which, in Requiem Masses, solemn or sung, it was forbidden, according to the Roman custom, to give Communion. They likewise suppress the prohibition which formerly prevented regulars from giving, in their own churches, Holy Communion on Easter Sunday, and even, in Rome, on Holy Thursday.[296]

251. So far as the carrying of Holy Communion to the sick is concerned, the *Codex* lays down the following rules:

294. If the rector has just reasons for refusing this permission, the priest can do nothing.

295. The Ordinary has not the right to issue a general decree forbidding Communion every day in all the private oratories of his diocese. He may do this in one oratory, on certain days, and for exceptional reasons.

296. In this last case, however, a contrary custom would have the force of law, if it went back a hundred years, and if the Ordinary thought it wise to retain it.
Vermeersch (Epitome, II, n. 111, 4) rightly remarks that, except when a grave motive demands the contrary, Christian charity requires the granting of the pastor's desire that he be permitted to give Communion to his parishioners himself at Easter time.

1. As a general rule, unless there be a just and reasonable excuse, the Blessed Sacrament is to be carried publicly[297] (c. 847). This is the rule repeated many times by the Holy See (Ritual, tit. IV, c. 4, n. 6), a rule which the Ordinary is bidden to enforce.

2. As it is a question here of a parochial function (c. 462, 3), the pastor alone has the right, within his parish, to *publicly* carry Communion to the sick, even when they are not members of his parish (c. 848, No. 1), or to give another priest permission to do so.

It is only in case of necessity, or with the permission at least presumed of the pastor or the Ordinary, that a priest may publicly carry Communion to the sick (c. 848, No. 2). This permission may safely be presumed if the pastor is absent or is prevented from doing so himself.

252. 3. When there is a just and reasonable cause, *any priest* may carry Holy Communion to a sick person *privately;* in this case, he has no need to obtain the permission of the pastor of the parish,[298] but only the permission, at least presumed, of the priest who has charge of the Blessed Sacrament (c. 849, No. 1).

It may be asked, in this connection, what is the "just and reasonable cause," and whether it is in the power of the Ordinary to specify the reasons which justify the private carrying of Holy Communion.

It is to be desired, of course, that all priests conform to the wishes of the diocesan authority; and the Ordinary has the right and the duty to check abuses which might diminish in the faithful the respect due to the Holy Eucharist. He would act wisely, therefore, by specifying *in general* the reasons which, in his diocese, appear to him sufficient to justify an exception to the law of the Church which demands that the Holy Eucharist shall be carried publicly.

We believe, however, that the Ordinary and the pastor have not, of themselves, the right to decide whether, in a particular case, Communion should be carried publicly or privately;[299] any priest who has the right to give Communion may decide this, keeping in mind the laws of the Church which aim at reconciling the respect

297. See further on (n. 342) what is meant by the public and the private carrying of Holy Communion.

298. The Ordinary cannot impose the obligation of asking for this permission.

299. The decree of the Congregation of the Sacraments (Dec. 23, 1912) authorized Ordinaries to give permission for the private carrying of Holy Communion to the sick who asked for it thru motives of devotion. This authorization of the Ordinaries is not mentioned by the *Codex,* which gives the permission to all priests in

due to Our Lord with the spiritual advantage of the faithful, and keeping himself in readiness, if need arises, to furnish the Ordinary with the reasons for his conduct.

Amongst the "reasonable" motives for not carrying the Holy Eucharist publicly, the following may be enumerated: the fear of some hostile manifestation or of scandal in heretical countries, or in irreligious communities; the opposition of the relatives of the sick person, who are afraid of incurring the enmity of the civil authorities, or the criticism of their neighbors, or the ill will of their customers; the timidity of the sick person himself, and his fear of uncharitable comment; the inconveniences which the *frequent* public carrying of the Eucharist into the same house might occasion; the decision taken by the pastor not to carry Communion to the sick more than once or twice a month or a week. For the Church desires that the faithful, and especially those who are sick, shall communicate as often as possible; and in certain cases the private carrying of the Blessed Sacrament is the only way to fulfill this desire.

253. 4. With the exception of the cases mentioned in the law[300] and cases of necessity, it is the pastor who has the exclusive right to carry *publicly or privately* Viaticum to the dying members of his parish (c. 850).

This right of the pastor in all probability applies only to the one Communion which is *obligatory, de jure divino et ecclesiastico,* in cases of serious illness which may result in death (c. 864, No. 1). This interpretation safeguards the spiritual interests of the sick person, by permitting him to ask any other priest for the Viaticum Communions which are permitted and recommended by the Church (c. 864, No. 3) during the course of the illness.[301]

254. It would be a mortal sin, commentators tell us, to disregard and trespass upon the rights of the pastor in what pertains to the public carrying of Communion and Viaticum.

---

general, when there is a "just and reasonable cause." Note well that the Church does not require a grave cause for this.

300. It is the first dignitary of the Chapter who is to bring Viaticum to the Bishop of the diocese (c. 397, 3); in a house belonging to a Religious Order, or in a seminary, it is the Superior who discharges this duty towards those who reside in the house (c. 415, 1. 1368); in a monastery, or in a religious house, it is the ordinary confessor or the chaplain designated by the Ordinary (c. 415, 2; 514, 3).

301. Vermeersch (Epitome, II, 114, 4). The same author holds that a simple priest can bring Communion as Viaticum to a sick person, even before the pastor has exercised his right, provided that the pastor be called in time to administer the last sacraments. The purpose of this is to not deprive the sick man of the blessings of frequent Communion at the time when he has most need of them.

Nevertheless, the excommunication which was formerly incurred by regulars who, without permission, dared to give Viaticum to the dying, has disappeared from the *Codex,* and no longer exists.

Article II.—The Extraordinary Minister

255. The *deacon* is the extraordinary minister of Holy Communion, with the permission of the Ordinary or the pastor, a permission which supposes a grave reason, but which can safely be presumed in case of necessity (c. 845, No. 2).

For the deacon, by reason of his ordination, is the immediate minister of the priest and his special auxiliary for the service of the Holy Eucharist. In the first centuries it was the deacon who presented the chalice to the faithful, or who carried Communion to the sick who could not come to the church.

However, according to present day regulations, such ministry always supposes the permission of an ordinary[302] minister, and such permission can be given only for a grave[303] reason.

Amongst the legitimate reasons for giving this permission, the following may be enumerated: the necessity of carrying Viaticum, if the pastor is absent, or cannot conveniently do it himself; a legitimate demand (even thru simple devotion) on the part of the faithful in the absence of the pastor; a considerable concourse of communicants at the Holy Table, when the pastor is the only priest available to give Communion; the fact that the pastor is obliged to attend to other duties (preaching, hearing confessions, preparation for a feast day), which would necessitate too long a wait on the part of the faithful.

256. Clerics inferior to the deacon have no right to give Holy Communion; and if they do so, they most certainly incur irregularity (c. 985, No. 7).

However, in case of extreme necessity, (for instance, if it is a question of carrying Viaticum to a dying person or to prisoners, especially if they cannot receive Penance and Extreme Unction), it appears certain that any cleric or even a simple laic can give

302. The permission of the rector of a church which is not a parish church is not enough.

303. It would be a mortal sin for the pastor to give this permission without a serious reason; it would likewise be a mortal sin for a deacon to distribute Holy Communion without permission or without a serious reason; however, he would not incur an irregularity, for irregularity affects those who exercise an order which they have not received, but not those who exercise without jurisdiction an order which they have received. Moreover, if there was urgent need of giving Communion, and if it was difficult for the deacon to find the pastor, he would have the right to presume permission.

Holy Communion. For in such a case it is a question of enabling Christians to fulfill an obligation of the divine law, and no particular prohibition can hinder, in such circumstances, an act which, in the first centuries, was commonly performed by the simple faithful.

To do this, authorization must be secured, if possible, from the Ordinary and the pastor; but, in their absence, such authorization may be safely presumed.

257. Is a priest allowed to give Communion to himself?—As a general rule, No!, when it is possible to ask for Communion from another priest.

In the absence of any other priest,[304] a priest who finds it impossible to say Mass, may give himself Holy Communion, even thru simple devotion, provided that the faithful are not thereby scandalized.

We have seen also (n. 255) that in the absence of the pastor, the deacon may, with his permission or with the permission of the Ordinary, give Communion to those of the faithful who, thru devotion, wish to communicate. Under the same conditions, we believe that the deacon may give Communion to himself, but it is only in case of necessity that he may presume the authorization of the Ordinary or the pastor (c. 845, No. 2).

As regards inferior clerics and lay persons, the right to give themselves Communion can be conceded only in case of urgent necessity (n. 256), (for instance, at the point of death, or in time of persecution),[305] provided always that there is no ordinary or extraordinary minister of Communion available, and provided that there is no danger of irreverence or profanation.

CHAPTER III

The Right and the Duty to Receive Communion

Article I.—Concerning Communion in General

258. To communicate is to receive the Body and Blood of Our Lord, present under the sacramental species.[306]

304. Even if a deacon were present, the priest could and should give Holy Communion to himself.

305. This custom was common in the primitive Church, and the Holy See authorized it during the persecutions of the 19th century in the Far East (Propaganda, July 21, 1844).

306. Since the 14th century in the Latin Church, the faithful do not receive Communion under the species of wine. The Council of Trent teaches that "they are not thereby deprived of any grace that is necessary for salvation." Moreover, it is the opinion of the majority of theologians that Communion under the two species

The Council of Trent, in harmony with many of the Fathers of the Church, distinguishes three kinds of Communions; the merely sacramental[307] Communion, which, because of mortal sin, produces no effects in the soul of the recipient; the spiritual[308] Communion, which is nothing else than the pious desire to receive the Blessed Eucharist; and finally, the Communion which is at one and the same time sacramental and spiritual, received by a soul which is in the state of grace.

259. That Holy Communion may produce its fruits, it is necessary that the sacred species be truly eaten.

It is not enough, therefore, as some few authors have claimed, that the host be introduced into the mouth and at once rejected; it must reach the stomach, for otherwise the words of Christ would not be realized, when He says that we must *eat* His flesh.[309]

On the other hand, the manner in which this manducation is accomplished makes very little difference. In spite of the controversies which still divide theologians, we believe that the miraculous Communions which are related in the lives of certain saints, are true Communions, and that the artificial means devised by science to bring food into the stomach without introducing it thru the

---

does not give any greater abundance of graces; for even under the one species of bread, it is Jesus Christ, whole and entire, the author of grace, who comes to us.

Everybody knows the reasons for which Communion under the two species was forbidden the faithful. There was a great risk of spilling the Precious Blood on the ground, and it was a difficult matter to carry the species of wine to the sick; moreover, in certain regions, it was difficult to procure the necessary amount of wine; moreover, some of the faithful objected to drinking from the same chalice as their neighbors; and some could not tolerate the taste of wine, especially if they were fasting. Finally, when heretics maintained that it was necessary to communicate under the two species, as though Christ were not present under each of them, it was thought wise to state the Catholic doctrine by eliminating the reception of one of them.

307. The reception of the Holy Eucharist is not even sacramental in the case of those who, not having received Baptism, are not capable of receiving the sacrament, and also, according to a very common opinion, in the case of those who have not at least the habitual or implicit intention of receiving it. However, there are some theologians who say that the Eucharist, being a permanent sacrament, may be received unfruitfully but never invalidly, even when there is no intention whatsoever. (Cappello, 85, 3).

308. All the saints have loved and practiced this exercise of piety; the council of Trent (Sess. XIII, c. 8) recommended it; and it should be urged upon the faithful as the source of many graces. It is composed of *an act of faith* in the Real Presence, *an act of desire to be united* with Jesus Christ thru the Holy Eucharist, *an act of petition* to request of Him the graces that He grants to those who receive him in reality. Spiritual Communion is recommended especially at Mass when we have not the happiness to communicate really, but it may be repeated as often as we wish and at any moment of the day.

309. We must not forget, however, that the Holy Eucharist nourishes our soul, not because we change the flesh of Christ into our own, but because Christ unites us to Himself, and this union does not require that the sacramental species be already corrupted; it would be a real Communion if the sacred species were rejected by the stomach, or even in the act of swallowing. According to Genicot (n. 196) it would be a true Communion if the Host remained in the mouth long enough to be substantially decomposed.

mouth, might well serve for the receiving of the Holy Eucharist as well as for any other food. *In practice,* these means should almost never be employed, even if the sick person is consequently to be deprived of Communion, unless it could be done without compromising the respect due to the Blessed Sacrament.[310] To make use of such means, we believe that it would be prudent to first secure the authorization of the Ordinary.

260. All theologians put the question as to how long a time the sacramental species remain in the stomach without being corrupted. The answer to this question throws light on the obligations of the communicant, and helps to avoid certain causes of profanation.

In reality, it is impossible to give any general rule; the answer will vary with the individual and with the actual condition of each stomach. Physicians tell us that, in a *healthy* stomach, the corruption of a small host demands at least a half-hour, and of a large host, a full hour. But in the case of certain classes of sick persons, it would take at least two or three hours (Gasparri, *de Euch.,* n. 1196).

Practical conclusions: avoid washing out the stomach for two or three hours after Communion; avoid with special care the commission of any mortal sin during that time, for, because of the corporal presence of Our Lord, the sin would have a special malice and might be a sacrilege; do not forget that, even several hours after Communion, a sick man may throw up fragments of the host which are not corrupted.[311]

261. It is certain that, *ex opere operantis,* we can secure more graces while the Body of Our Lord is within us that at any other time.

Moreover, we must not forget that the special effects of the Holy Eucharist (*ex opere operato*) increase according to the fervor of the dispositions of the communicant. And the faithful are to be encouraged to multiply, during their thanksgiving after Communion, the acts of faith, hope, charity, humility, and contrition,

---

310. In a particular instance, the Holy Office replied that it was not proper to give Viaticum through an incision made in the chest for the purpose of introducing food directly into the stomach (Jan. 27, 1886). It may well be, however, that at times there are means of safeguarding at one and the same time the respect due the Sacrament, and the interests of the sick person.

311. If these species are discernible, they should be taken up with all respect, and kept in a sacred place until the corruption is completed; they should be then thrown into the *piscina.* If there is no discernible evidence of the sacred species, but doubt persists that they are not yet corrupted, the whole mass is to be burnt, and the ashes thrown into the *piscina.*

which will fit them to receive more abundantly the graces of the sacrament.[312]

Article II.—The Right to Receive Communion

262. This right is enjoyed by every baptized person, unless there is a legitimate prohibition to the contrary (c. 853).

Restrictions placed on the right to receive Communion may be of divine origin or of ecclesiastical origin. For the Church has received from Christ the power to administer the sacraments and to lay down the rules which guarantee their proper and fruitful use.

263. De jure divino, every *human being* who has received *the Baptism of water,* may fruitfully receive Holy Communion, provided he is in the state of grace. Our Lord has not excluded either infants or those adults who have never had the use of reason, and, as a matter of fact, the custom of giving Communion to infants, formerly general thruout the Church, is still in vigor in the Orient.[313]

264. The Church, in the course of the ages, has put certain restrictions on this right. As a general rule, she refuses today to give Communion to *all those who have not and never have had the use of reason.*

This law excludes: 1. Infants who have not yet reached the age of reason[314] (cf. n. 308).

312. In the effort to emphasize the efficacy of the sacrament itself (*ex opere operato*), we have, perhaps, during recent years, ignored too much the importance of the acts of the communicant in making Communion fruitful. We must often remind the faithful that the fruits of Communion depend on their dispositions; these dispositions do not cause grace, for that is due to the sacrament alone; but they are the conditions without which grace cannot be produced. The window is not the cause of the light which enters a house; the sole cause of the light is the sun. But the window is the indispensable condition for the entrance of the light, and the larger the window, the more abundantly the light will enter into the house. In like manner the results of Communion vary with the dispositions of those who receive it. Between that minimum of dispositions which is made up of the state of grace and the right intention, and the dispositions of the Blessed Mother of God, there are in those who receive Communion widely varying degrees, to which correspond as many degrees of Eucharistic fruitfulness (F. Vernet). "I am ready to believe," said Father Faber, "that no one has ever derived from the sacraments all the grace that they contain, not even our ever blessed Mother in her Communions."

313. On the contrary, neither the angels, nor the souls that are separated from their bodies, or reunited to those bodies after the last judgment, nor catechumens, are capable of receiving this sacrament.

As for those whose Baptism is doubtful, they are to be considered as capable of receiving Communion.

314. In the Council of Trent, some theologians maintained that Communion increased even in tiny children the grace that had been received in Baptism; others held that grace could not be increased without any personal disposition on the part of the communicant; the Council did not decide the question, and while it declared that the custom followed in Christian antiquity was not to be censured, it contented itself with defining that Communion is not necessary for infants who have not yet come to the use of reason.

2. All those who are born insane, and who have never had the use of reason; they are rightfully looked upon as infants (c. 88, No. 3).

But their insanity may possibly be not general; a person whose reason may be defective on other subjects, might be able to discern the Body of Christ from ordinary food and give it respectful adoration; he might even be able to know the chief mysteries of faith and have a true devotion for the Holy Eucharist. In the first case, we cannot see why Communion should be refused him at the point of death; and in the second case, we cannot see why he should not be treated as an ordinary Christian.

Theoretically, the same argument applies to those insane who have lucid intervals; *practically,* it is often difficult to know whether this lucidity is sufficient. And to justify the giving of Communion, there must always be a moral certainty that there is no danger of irreverence.

265. What of those who have become insane after reaching the age of reason?—When they have lucid intervals, there *may* be sufficient reason to justify giving them Communion. Apart from this supposition, the common opinion is that, *except in case of danger of death,* they are to be regarded as incapable of receiving Communion. When they are in danger of death, many theologians hold that they should be given Viaticum, provided that, before becoming insane, they were faithful to the practices of religion (which would suppose, on their part, the implicit intention of receiving Communion), and provided that there is no reason to apprehend any grave irreverence on their part.—*Practically,* because of the circumstances, this obligation would very often be quite doubtful; and it would be wise to desist as soon as there is any appearance of danger of exposing the Blessed Sacrament to profanation.

266. The same holds true of *imbeciles, idiots by birth,* or those who have become so after having had the full use of reason. The common opinion is that they are to be given Communion only at Easter time and at the hour of death. As a matter of fact, in this regard there are *as many different cases as there are individuals,* and only the confessor can decide as to the dispositions of his penitent and permit more or less frequent Communions (Genicot, n. 190, II).

267. When a fit comes on, *epileptics* may not receive Com-

munion, except perhaps in danger of death if there is no fear of irreverence. *Possessed* persons find precious assistance in the Holy Eucharist, and frequent Communion is recommended for them; but it is better to refuse it to them in their violent moments.[315]

268. Deaf-blind-mutes are ordinarily to be treated as infants. However, in these days, very often it is possible to cultivate their intellects enough to give them a sufficient knowledge of Catholic doctrine and to arouse in them a desire for the Holy Eucharist. In such cases, there is nothing to prevent them from receiving Holy Communion.

This is still more applicable to simple *deaf-mutes.*

269. Finally, it may happen that a particular sickness or infirmity militates against the respect which the receiving of the Blessed Sacrament demands; in this case it is not allowed to give Communion.

Such would be the case of sick persons who were subject to frequent fits of vomiting. Before arriving at a decision in such cases, it would be well to consult a competent physician and find out whether or no there is danger of irreverence; the danger may cease, sometimes several hours, sometimes a few minutes after an attack.

Coughing is less to be dreaded; and yet there are times when, because of its extreme violence, it may prevent the swallowing of the Host. It is prudent then, as also in the preceding case, to experiment first with an unconsecrated host.

270. As regards persons who are stricken unconscious in the very act of sin, or who, after a scandalous life, become dangerously ill, it is not allowed to give them Communion unless they have first shown some unequivocal signs of repentance. The respect due to the Blessed Sacrament does not permit us to accept, merely for the purpose of giving them Communion, signs of doubtful or well-nigh imaginary contrition, which might be enough to justify us in giving conditional absolution, or Extreme Unction.

271. The Church, as we shall see later on (n. 294), forbids all sinners to receive Holy Communion; and she imposes on her ministers the duty of refusing Communion to those who are unworthy.

315. When a sick man is in delirium, it is wise, before attempting to give him Holy Communion, to offer him an unconsecrated particle, to see how he will act. If there is any serious reason to anticipate irreverence, Communion is not to be given him.

The course to follow varies as that unworthiness is occult or public, and also according as the request for Communion is made by the sinner publicly or in secret.[316]

1. *A public sinner is to be refused Communion,* whether in the presence of the faithful, or in secret. There is no obligation in such a case of safeguarding the honor of our neighbor, and on the contrary there is an obligation to protect the Blessed Sacrament from profanation, to avoid co-operating in the sin of another, and to prevent the scandal of the faithful.

And who are public sinners?—The *Codex* mentions those who are under excommunication or interdict, when they are publicly known to be so, and also those who are manifestly *infames,* so long as they have not been reconciled to the Church and have not atoned for the scandals of their life. In this category may also be included concubinarians, prostitutes, those who are known to be carrying on an immoral business, or who are known to be performing acts which are explicitly condemned by the civil or ecclesiastical laws. The Ritual also mentions usurers, blasphemers, etc.; but generally we may (at least in our country) regard them as reconciled when they have gone to confession. Towards other sins public opinion is more indulgent; ordinarily we do not regard as a public sinner a man who calls himself a radical or a socialist. And yet such a man would have to be refused Communion, if the concession of Communion would be looked upon by the people as an approval of error, or sought for by the interested party as a means to conceal the malice of his doctrines.

272. Any sinner may recover the right to receive Communion by an amendment of his life *proportioned to the nature of his sins.* Sometimes the fact that the people know that he has gone to confession will be atonement enough; and no other proof of conversion is to be exacted from those whose sins have not been the cause

316. A public sinner is one whose sinfulness is known to the bulk of the community, either because it has been proclaimed by a legal tribunal, or because it has been publicly acknowledged by the offender himself, or because the sin was committed in such circumstances as to leave no one in doubt, or because it must speedily become widely known.

The publicity is relative when a portion of the community (half or about half) does not know of the guilt of the sinner. Outside of these cases, the sinner is occult.

A person demands Communion *publicly* when he presents himself at the Holy Table at the same time with others, or in the presence of a group of the faithful who know of his crime.

The demand would be *occult* if there were no one else present besides the priest, or if only children were present, or idiots, or a few people who were not paying any attention to what was going on, and who would not notice the refusal of the priest.

of scandal or seriously disturbed the public peace.[317] And the priest who is giving Communion may ordinarily presume that those who ask for it have gone to confession.

But in certain circumstances a public retraction or apology is also to be exacted. Anyone who has given formal and public adhesion to a heretical sect cannot be admitted to the Holy Table until he has abjured his errors; anyone who has scandalized his brethren by his criminal conduct must atone for his sin by leaving the person who has led him into evil, or by giving up the profession which is to him the proximate occasion of sin.

Even at the point of death, this apology or retraction must be demanded *in the presence of two witnesses.* If there were special reasons, the confessor might accept a secret retraction from the sick man coupled with his permission (in writing, if possible) to make known his submission to the laws of the Church.

It is not always possible to secure the separation of two *complices* (v.g., in certain cases of concubinage or civil marriage), either because the sick man cannot go elsewhere, or because the other party refuses to leave the house. This is no reason for refusing absolution to the dying man if he is *well disposed;* but in that case it is not allowed to bring Holy Communion to him, *at least publicly.*

273. When there is doubt as to the publicity of the sin, it is better to give Communion. When the doubt bears on the sufficiency of the retraction or the undoing of the scandal, it is better, as a general rule, to refuse Communion. However, the circumstances are to be taken into account; and if the refusal would result in greater evil, the priest might be less severe, or he might ask for direction from the Ordinary of the place.

In cases where the unworthiness of the sinner is known to only a portion of the community, or in cases where that unworthiness, altho public, is unknown in the place where the sinner is asking for Communion, the decision will vary according to circumstances. Ordinarily, by reason of the lack of knowledge on the part of the public, it would be permissible to safeguard the reputation of the sinner by granting his request. But thought is to be given to the impression that will be produced by the refusal or the according of Communion upon the community of the faithful; to give Com-

317. If the confessions were followed by frequent relapses, there would be reason to warn the penitent and to refuse him Communion for some time, as a test and to prevent the scandal of the faithful.

munion would be a scandal if the unworthiness of the sinner was just about to become public.[318]

274. 2. *Communion must be refused* to an *occult* sinner who asks for it *secretly* (c. 855, No. 2), since, in this case, there is no occasion to fear the disgrace of the sinner nor the scandal of the faithful. The answer to this problem will be different, however, if the priest knows the unworthiness of the sinner only thru the confessional.

275. 3. *Communion is to be given* to an *occult* sinner who asks for it *publicly* (c. 855, No. 2), either because refusal would bring disgrace upon him, or because it would produce evil results for the community of the faithful.

276. Apart from the respect which is due to the sacrament, the Church forbids all the faithful from receiving Communion more than once a day (c. 857). Thus, a priest cannot, under pain of sacrilege, say Mass after having communicated, or receive Communion after having said Mass, even if he possessed for that day (v.g., on Christmas) the privilege of saying three Masses.

The *Codex* mentions, however, three important exceptions: (1) It would be permissible, nay, even obligatory, to communicate twice if it was necessary to save the Holy Eucharist from profanation, even material (v.g., a conflagration); (2) It would be permissible, and even recommended, to communicate a second time, if, after receiving Communion in the morning, one were to fall into danger of death (cf. n. 290).

Article III.—The Duty of Receiving Communion

No. 1. The Obligation *De Jure Divino*

277. Our Lord has most certainly imposed on all adult Christians the duty of receiving Communion.[319] This is plain from his words: "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you." By this declaration, Christ does not, indeed, impose the Eucharist as necessary *necessi-*

318. It is not forbidden to refuse Communion to persons who present themselves at the Holy Table in an unbecoming garb, especially when they have been warned of the demands of Christian modesty. Such a refusal, the reasons for which are known to everybody, is only a lesson, and cannot do any great harm to their reputation. However, in such matters, we must take into account the circumstances of persons and places, and in any event, merely refuse Communion by passing by the person without rebuking him or her publicly.

319. By this we are to understand all those who are capable of receiving it; it follows from this, that those who have not the required dispositions for receiving Communion, must duly prepare themselves for the accomplishment of this great duty

tate medii, since all Tradition declares that it is possible to attain eternal life without it, but His words contain, nevertheless, a formal command to communicate.[320]

This is also indicated by the institution of the sacrament under the form of food and drink. Our Lord wishes in this manner to make us understand how necessary it is for the preservation of the life of the soul, since it furnishes us with the most abundant aids to nourish our soul and to enable it to resist sin.[321]

278. Nevertheless, Our Lord has not said how often we must receive His body and blood. All that we can conclude with certainty, from the analogy which exists between the Eucharist and bodily food, is that He wishes us to receive this sacrament a number of times during our life. The Church, the sovereign interpreter of His will, has made this obligation precise according to the circumstances and the dispositions of the faithful, in the course of the ages.

279. From the nature of the sacrament, it is plain that there is an obligation *de jure divino* to receive it whenever we are in danger of death (cf. n. 288).

280. It is quite certain also that Communion, especially frequent Communion, is the most efficacious means of overcoming temptation, especially temptations against holy purity. It is to be recommended most earnestly to sorely tempted souls; but there is no justification for maintaining that it is obligatory *de jure divino* for them, since there are other means (like prayer, mortification) for obtaining the graces necessary to conquer temptation.

No. 2. The Obligation *De Jure Ecclesiastico*

281. As a general rule, every Christian of either sex, as soon as he reaches the age of discretion, is bound to receive Communion at least once a year,[322] during the Easter time (c. 859, No. 1).

---

320. Communion is morally necessary for adults to persevere in grace; the words of Christ show very clearly that the Eucharist is the normal food of supernatural life. He who abstains voluntarily and for a long time from receiving it, runs the risk of not being able to secure in full measure the aids which guarantee the maintenance of that life; and he exposes himself to the weakening and the loss of what he already has (F. Vernet).

321. The necessity of Communion for the soul is not absolute like the necessity of material food for the body, for sanctifying grace is lost only through sin. This necessity comes, therefore, from the will of God rather than from the nature of things.

322. It is a question here of the ecclesiastical year, which extends from one Paschal season to the next. Certain authors, however, even those of our own times, take it to refer also to the *civil year,* so that he who has received Communion during the month of January last, has satisfied the divino-ecclesiastical precept for the year (Vermeersch, Epitome, II, n. 126).

This canon repeats and gives precision to the command of Our Lord; but it is the Church who has assigned the fulfillment of this duty to the Easter season. Every Christian, therefore, is bound by a twofold obligation: Communion at least once a year (the divino-ecclesiastical and principal obligation), and Communion during the Easter time (the ecclesiastical and secondary obligation). Both of them bind *sub gravi*. Consequently anyone who, thru forgetfulness or thru deliberate neglect, fails to receive Communion at Easter time, is still bound, under pain of mortal sin, to receive Communion during the year[323] (c. 859, No. 4).

282. This precept binds all the faithful, as soon as they reach the age of reason; the sick, prisoners, and excommunicated persons must take the proper steps to obey it. And it is a grave obligation for the pastor to give them the opportunity to receive Communion.

However, the pastor or the confessor, for legitimate reasons referring to the spiritual[323a] welfare of a parishioner or a penitent, may advise him to delay for some time the fulfillment of this duty (c. 859, No. 1). This is a sort of dispensation from the general precept, and the confessor can grant it even outside the tribunal of Penance. It may be more or less prolonged according to the nature of the reasons which justify it.

283. The Easter time extends from Palm Sunday to *Quasimodo* Sunday. For good reasons, that is, when personal or local circumstances demand it, (the custom of the place, the lack of confessors, etc.), the Ordinary may anticipate or prolong the Easter time, but never before the 4th Sunday of Lent, or beyond Trinity Sunday[324] (c. 859, No. 2). This favor applies not only to all the faithful belonging to the diocese, but also to those who have neither domicile nor quasi-domicile anywhere else, and even, according to the opinion of reputable authors (Cappello, n. 476), to all who are *at the moment* within the limits of the diocese.

284. The precept relating to Easter Communion is not satisfied by a Communion made outside the time specified by the law or by the Ordinary. If such a Communion was made before the

---

323. This precept, however, does not contain the obligation to receive Communion as soon as possible; it merely demands that the Christian receive Communion sometime during the course of the Paschal year. The faithful are not to be left under the impression that they commit a sin every time they neglect the opportunity to receive Communion.

323a. These motives ordinarily arise from the actual indisposition of the penitent or from the desire to afford him a more perfect preparation.

324. The Holy See readily grants to Ordinaries indults to prolong the Paschal time.

Easter time, it must be repeated within the Easter time itself.[325]

Likewise the precept is not satisfied by a sacrilegious Communion (c. 861). If God commands us to receive Communion, it is because of the graces which the sacrament procures for us; and these graces are given to us only by a good Communion. Those, therefore, who receive Communion at Easter time in the state of mortal sin, are still bound by the precept.

On the contrary, every Communion made during the Easter time, even without the intention of satisfying the precept, satisfies the obligation imposed by the Church.

285. In opposition to the old law, it is no longer a strict obligation to make one's Easter Communion in one's own parish. The faithful, however, should be urged to follow this custom, which has in view, according to our opinion, not only the receiving of Communion within the territory of the parish, but within the parish church itself. Those who receive their Easter Communion in a strange parish should notify[326] their own pastor of the fact (c. 859, No. 3).

286. On Holy Thursday, it is *proper* that all clerics, even priests who do not say Mass on that day, should receive Communion at the solemn or conventual Mass (c. 862).

This advice (for it is not a formal precept),[327] has for its purpose the more striking commemoration of the institution of the Holy Eucharist and of the distribution of Communion by Christ to His apostles.

287. Let us, finally, recall another Eucharistic precept, the one which binds all the clerics who are promoted to a major order (sub-deacons, deacons, and priests),[327a] to receive Communion at

325. If, therefore, at the beginning of the year, a person foresees that it will not be possible for him to receive Communion at the Easter time, he is not *obliged* to receive Communion before that time, and neither his confessor nor his pastor can anticipate the Paschal time for him. He should, however, be urged to receive Communion; and the impossibility of receiving during the Easter season excuses him from all sin. But he is not thereby dispensed from the obligation of receiving during the course of the year in order to satisfy the divino-ecclesiastical precept (cf., however, n. 281, note).

326. This is only a counsel, say certain authors (Cappello, n. 475); others hold that the word *curent* indicates a true precept, but *sub levi* (Vermeersch, Epitome, n. 128).

327. Nevertheless, some authors (Cappello, n. 479) say that Communion on Holy Thursday is obligatory for all the clerics attached to the cathedral church, and for them alone. Several decrees of the Congregation of Rites affirm this obligation, and the *Codex* has not explicitly abrogated them.

327a. The obligation is certainly grave for newly ordained priests, for they are bound to insure the integrity of the sacrifice which they offer in union with the Bishop.

the Mass of ordination (c. 1005). Those who receive Tonsure or Minor Orders are not bound by this precept, but it is very proper that they, too, should receive Communion.

No. 3. Communion as Viaticum

288. In case of danger of death, from whatever cause, the faithful are bound to receive Communion (c. 864, No. 1).

Anyone is in danger of death[328] as soon as the state of his health, or the circumstances in which he finds himself, inspire serious uneasiness concerning his life, and give reason to fear a fatal issue. This state may be the consequence of a grave malady, of a wound, of childbirth which special reasons make perilous. Amongst the circumstances which entail a probable danger of death may be cited the following: the approach of a battle (at least for certain classes of combatants), of a serious operation, and, with still greater reason, of the execution of the death penalty.[329]

As soon as a person is in danger of death for any of the above mentioned reasons, he is bound to receive Communion. For the moment of death is the time when we feel most keenly the need of grace, to resist the attacks of the devil. It is a *grave* obligation, then, based on the divine law, and the *Codex* reminds those who have charge of the sick and especially pastors, that they are bound to see that the sick receive Viaticum while they have the use of their senses[330] (c. 865).

In case of doubt as to the certainty of the danger of death, there is no strict obligation to receive Communion, but it is allowed to do so.[331]

289. To satisfy the precept, it is not necessary to have the formal intention of fulfilling it. Any Communion received during

328. One is *at the point of death* when death is not only probable, but morally certain and almost inevitable. However, in the law, this term is ordinarily given the same meaning as *in danger of death.*

329. The older theologians often classed amongst the circumstances which entailed the danger of death, the approach of a long journey. In our times, unless under special circumstances, there is very little reason to fear this danger.

330. The Ritual (tit. V, c. 4, n. 1 to 10) emphasizes the importance of this ministry; it urges the priest not to wait until he is summoned, but to visit the sick man at once, to make him understand his condition, and tell him of his obligation to receive the last sacraments as early as possible.

331. The obligation of Viaticum also applies to children who have not yet received their First Communion, but who have the required dispositions. Those who have charge of these children are bound to procure this blessing for them. The decree *Quam singulari* (n. VIII), terms detestable the abuse whereby children who have the use of reason are deprived of Viaticum. This obligation does not exist if the discretion of the child is doubtful; but even then it is better to give Communion.

the time of danger is sufficient, even if the communicant has no suspicion of the danger.

In like manner, the obligation disappears with the danger of death. The sick person who, knowing his perilous condition and knowing also the precept which binds him, fails to receive Communion, commits a sin; but he is not bound to supply the deficiency by another Communion.

290. In case a person has received Communion in the morning, and falls seriously sick that same day and finds himself in danger of death, he should be strongly urged to receive Communion a second time in the form of Viaticum (c. 864, No. 2).—There is no formal obligation for him to do this, but Communion is permitted, and is warmly encouraged.

According to most theologians, the same rule may be followed if the sick man has made his Communion of devotion some days (five or six, for example) before becoming dangerously ill. There would be in this case, however, still more reason to urge him to receive Communion a second time.

291. When the danger of death is prolonged, it is permitted, and it is eminently proper (following, however, the *advice* of the confessor), to receive Viaticum several times, *but on different days* (c. 864, No. 3). The precept referring to Viaticum, therefore, is fulfilled by one single Communion, no matter how long the sickness may last; but it is the desire of the Church, if there is nothing to hinder, that the sick man who is in danger of death shall receive Communion several times, even daily, without being obliged to observe the law of fast.[332]

Note well, however, the explicit prohibition of the Church against giving Viaticum several times on the same day to the same person.

---

332. As soon as a sick man is in danger of death, and as long as that danger lasts, he is dispensed from the law of the Eucharistic fast. But when the danger comes from an external cause (the approach of a battle, an operation, a capital execution) he must, *unless it would be seriously inconvenient,* wait till he is fasting before receiving Communion.

We have seen above (n. 253) that, outside of cases of necessity, the bringing of Viaticum is the right of the pastor.

It is allowed to carry Viaticum at any hour of the day or night (c. 867, 5), even though, in the latter case, the condition of the sick man would permit waiting till daylight. The Church would again make the reception of the last sacraments as easy as possible.

Viaticum is given in the same manner as the Communion of the Sick. There is just one difference to remark; the priest, in giving the Sacred Host, uses a special formula, *Accipe, frater, (or soror) Viaticum . . .* If he fears that the use of this formula would frighten the sick man, by revealing to him the seriousness of his condition (which is very seldom the case) he may use the ordinary formula.

CHAPTER IV

Dispositions Required for Communion

The dispositions required for the reception of the graces of the sacrament refer to both the soul and the body. After duly explaining them, we shall set forth the doctrine of the Church regarding the Communion of children, frequent Communion, and the Communion of the sick.

Article I.—Spiritual Dispositions

292. THE INTENTION.—To derive from Communion the fruits it contains, we must know what this sacrament contains, and we must have the desire to profit by it.

These are the sentiments presupposed by the intention of receiving Communion, the intention which every adult must have when approaching the Holy Table; for, in the business of our salvation, God always demands a certain cooperation on our part. However, an *actual* intention is not required; it is enough to have formulated the intention and not retracted it (explicit habitual intention). At the point of death, it is permitted to presume this intention from the habitual dispositions of the dying person (implicit habitual intention).

293. EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN CENSURES.—The *Codex* declares that excommunication and personal interdict deprive him who is under these censures, of the use of the sacraments (c. 2260, No. 1, c. 2275, No. 2). It would be a mortal sin to ignore this prohibition, unless lawfully excused because of ignorance, fear, or other serious inconvenience.—Moreover, this condition is presupposed by the obligation of being in the state of grace in order to receive Communion, since, to receive absolution from one's sins, one must first have obtained absolution from the censures which forbid the reception of the sacraments (c. 2250).

294. THE STATE OF GRACE SECURED THROUGH CONFESSION.—The Eucharist is a sacrament of the living, and hence presupposes the state of grace in him who receives it, even as bread presupposes life in the body which is nourished by it.[333]

333. We must beware of the exaggerations of certain preachers who, in order to emphasize the malice of sacrilegious Communions, call it the worst of all sins, equal to the treason of Judas. In spite of certain points of resemblance, there is no equality between these two sins, and it is wrong to say that, considered objectively, a sacrilegious Communion is the worst of all sins.

For this sin is directly opposed to the virtue of religion, and therefore less grave, *in itself*, than sins against faith, hope, and charity. Moreover, amongst the sins against religion, it is inferior to perjury, which is directly opposed to the respect due

But whereas to prepare oneself for the reception of the other sacraments of the same category, it is enough, strictly speaking, to make an act of perfect contrition (although it is always better and safer to go to confession), he who wishes to receive Holy Communion and knows that he is guilty of mortal sin, must necessarily first reconcile himself with Almighty God by means of sacramental confession; the only exception to this rule is found in a case where it is necessary to receive Communion and where there is no confessor available (c. 856).

Most authors consider this law as of divine origin. Some of the Fathers of the Church base their belief in this matter on the words of St. Paul: *Probet autem seipsum homo.* However, this text does not indicate that confession is the sole means of preparing for Communion; and therefore other theologians hold that it is the Church herself, who, taking into account the commonly received interpretation of the words of the Apostles, has made sacramental confession a rigorous obligation for sinners.[334]

295. To justify the reception of Holy Communion without confession, the two conditions mentioned by the law must *be present at one and the same time:* the absence of a confessor, and the necessity of receiving Communion.

1. *The absence of a confessor* (cf. n. 93, b).

2. *The grave and urgent necessity* of receiving Communion. There is in practice no other case of this kind for the faithful, than the obligation of receiving Communion in order to avoid disgrace, as, for instance, when one recalls a mortal sin when he is already at the Communion rail and when he cannot retire without exciting the curiosity of the faithful,[335] or again, tho rarely, the obligation

---

to God, and inferior to the crime of the executioners who wounded Jesus in His own flesh whereas this sacrilege affects Our Lord only under the sacramental species. Finally, one who would cast the Blessed Eucharist on the ground, or cover it with filth, would commit a sacrilege more serious than would he who would receive Communion in the state of mortal sin, even though the sin of the latter were not extenuated by any sentiment of fear or human respect (cf. St. Thomas, Summa, III, q. 80, 5).

We do not wish to minimize the malice of sacrilegious Communions, but neither should we, by baseless exaggerations, produce despair in the souls of the faithful, and expecially in children.

334. In the Council of Trent, many Bishops and many theologians, without denying that the act of contrition is sufficient, held that the *Church*, in order to obtain with more certainty the necessary preparation and thus avoid bad Communions, had to make sacramental confession compulsory.

335. A person who receives Communion every day (even in a religious school or in a community) is not dispensed from the obligation of confessing a mortal sin because of the fear of provoking surprise or criticism if she refrains from receiving Communion. In order to have an answer in readiness for possible questions, she may provide herself with an excuse by breaking her fast, or by taking refuge behind the desire for a more perfect preparation.

of communicating in order to prevent a sacrilegious profanation (Lehmkuhl, n. 207).

Even when these two conditions coexist in the same case, the divine law demands that he who receives Communion shall first make an act of perfect contrition. Attrition will not suffice.

296. It may happen that after a good confession one may remember that he has involuntarily forgotten a mortal sin. In such a case, there is no *obligation* to go to confession again before receiving Communion; at least this is the most probable opinion. For the penitent has been truly, altho indirectly, justified by sacramental confession, and that is all that is required by the law in question.

Moreover, the penitent in this case is not even bound to make an act of contrition; he who is already justified does not need a second justification.[336]

297. There is no need of dwelling here upon the means recommended by the Church to derive a greater abundance of graces from this sacrament; to be as free as possible from venial sins, to make acts of faith, humility, and desire before Communon, and of adoration, thanksgiving, love, and supplication after Communion. To fail, without reasons, to make any preparation *and especially any thanksgiving,* would not be without taint of venial sin, at least in persons who realize their obligations. And it is the duty of the priest to instruct the people how to profit by moments which are so precious.

Article II.—The Bodily Dispositions

No. 1.—The Natural Fast

298. The principal bodily disposition required for the reception of Holy Communion is the Eucharistic or natural fast[337] (c. 858, No. 1). It consists in this, that the communicant has not taken, since midnight, any food or drink or medicine, even the least possible quantity. It would be a *mortal* sin to receive Com-

From this difficulty it is plainly to be seen that it is not wise to urge everybody indiscriminately to daily Communion; and care must be taken to see that the members of religious communities shall be enabled to have recourse easily to the services of a confessor before receiving Communion.

336. He should, however, be earnestly *advised* to make use of one or the other of these means. The same course is to be followed with those who, after a sincere examination, arrive, not at the certainty, but at the doubt that they have committed sin. They are not bound to go to confession, for the precept applies only to those who are conscious of a mortal sin; but they will act wisely by doing so, or by making an act of contrition, so as not to deprive themselves of the graces of the sacrament.

337. We must not confuse this fast with the ecclesiastical fast, which consists essentially in taking only one full meal a day (c. 1251, 1).

munion after having intentionally taken a few drops of water after midnight; even an error of good faith (v.g., the taking of a drink at two o'clock in the morning because the clock had stopped at a quarter before twelve) does not dispense from the law.

It is a prescription of the Ecclesiastical law, from which, consequently, the Holy See can, and frequently does, dispense.[338] Its purpose is to secure for the august Sacrament the respect which is its due.

299. This law of fast begins to bind from midnight. The middle of the night may be calculated either according to local[339] (real or standard) time, or according to legal time (ordinary or extraordinary) (c. 33, No. 1), which means that *no matter which time is in use in the place,* the individual is free to adopt for his own case the time that is most advantageous to him.[340] He may, therefore, follow the solar time, or the time given by the public clocks[341] (that is, standard or legal time).

---

338. For the faithful, it is the Congregation of the Sacraments which grants the dispensation; for religious, it is the Congregation for the Religious. But it is better to communicate with the Holy See by means of the Ordinary, who adds his recommendation to the petition, and gives the reasons for asking the dispensation. It may be well also to enclose a physician's certificate. (For priests, cf. n. 86).

339. We know that the *real time* is calculated by the passage of the sun across the meridian of the place (the meridian is an imaginary circle which passes thru the poles, and which includes, together with the axis of the earth, the vertical of the place, that is, the line which extends from the place to the center of the earth); the time that elapses between two crossings of the sun over the same meridian constitutes the *true solar day* of that place.

But this time is not always exactly the same; the solar day has sometimes more, sometimes less than 24 hours. So as to have days of equal length, we have divided the time for the annual (or rather, the semi-annual) course of the sun by a fixed number of days, so as to obtain for each day a fixed portion of the solar travel. The day of 24 hours is a purely imaginary ideal which corresponds exactly with the solar time only four times a year (December 25, April 15, June 15, and September 1).

The *legal time* is that which has been determined for a region by the legislative authority of one or more countries, or even by custom. It consists in giving arbitrarily the same hour at the same instant to all the places in a certain region. To this end, we divide the equatorial circle into 24 equal parts of 15 degrees each (starting with the Greenwich meridian) and make these divisions meet at the two poles; the space included between two adjacent lines constitutes a *time section* and it is agreed that all the places in the same section have the same time at any one instant. This is the *ordinary legal time.* But this determination may arise from causes which are peculiar to a certain time or a certain country; thus, for reasons of economy, during the summer in France, the legal day begins and ends at 11 o'clock at night; this is *extraordinary legal time* (cf. l'Ami du Clergé, 20, 407).

340. In spite of the contrary opinion of many authors, we believe that it is lawful to change our system of computing time for the observation of different precepts; that it is permitted, for instance, to follow the solar time for the recitation of the Breviary, the standard time for the law of abstinence, and the legal time for the law of fast. There is nothing which calls for us to put restrictions on the privilege of the legislator.

341. If the clocks do not agree, it is permissible to follow the one that strikes last, unless we know from other sources that it is wrong.

When, in a certain locality, it is *certain* that the legal time, whatever it may be, is ahead of the solar time (the advance of the legal time may sometimes amount to 30 minutes) we are not bound, in that interval, to observe the law of the Eucharistic fast.

According to the most common opinion, the law of fast begins to bind with the *first stroke* of midnight. However, the contrary opinion may be followed in practice, for it is not certain that in all clocks the first stroke marks the end of the day. Moreover, all theologians agree that there is no obligation to spit out what one has in one's mouth when midnight strikes.

One is obliged to refrain from receiving Communion only when one is certain that he has taken something after midnight. So long as doubt exists, whether concerning the fact or having eaten or drunk, or concerning the exact moment (before or after midnight), it is allowed to receive Communion. This does not mean that it is permitted, during the night, to neglect to ascertain the time, to take some food or drink, and then to allege ignorance as a justification for receiving Communion; before taking the food or drink, one must, for reasons which are at least probable, have concluded that it is not yet midnight.[342]

300. The law of the Eucharistic fast is broken only when the three following conditions are realized at one and the same time:

1. It is required that the substance taken, *received into the stomach,* shall have come from the exterior.

It is not breaking the fast, then, to swallow, even voluntarily, blood which flows from the gums or from the nose through the back of the mouth or from a wound in the interior of the mouth itself,[343] or to swallow the fragments of food which may remain in the mouth from the meal of the night before,[344] or to take into the mouth food or drink (v.g., to taste wine or soup) and to spit it out at once.

2. It is required that there shall be *the act of eating or drinking,* and not merely aspiration or simple swallowing of saliva which may have entailed, without any intention of taking nourishment, the absorption of some slight amount of solid or liquid substance.

Whenever, therefore, one *voluntarily* takes, as nourishment, even a slight quantity of food or drink, the fast is broken; the same

342. It is allowed to receive Communion even tho, on awaking, we recall that during the night we took a cough lozenge, and are not certain that it was entirely absorbed before midnight; or if it is quite certain that the lozenge, tho kept in the mouth all the night, is still practically intact.

343. The fast would be broken if the blood came from the outside, v.g., from the lips, the nose; or if abundant tears flowed into the mouth.

344. On the contrary, it would be a continuation of the meal, and the fast would be broken, if, after midnight, one were to eat or allow to melt in the mouth a bit of sugar (or any other substance) which one had put in the mouth before midnight.

holds true if one eats, without adverting to it, a mouthful of food, or swallows a mouthful of water during one's sleep.[345]

On the other hand, it is permitted, without breaking the fast, to wash out one's mouth, to put in place false teeth which are wet with water, to taste wine or any other liquid, to gargle the throat, even tho, *by chance,* some drops of the substance may mix with the saliva and pass into the stomach. Nor is any account to be taken of an insect, a drop of rain, a snowflake, etc., which the respiration may draw, without premeditation, into the œsophagus; or of a drop of blood or sweat which, trickling into the mouth, is involuntarily mixed with the saliva. It is also permitted to smoke, to take snuff, to chew tobacco,[346] even tho some fragments may mix with the saliva and enter the stomach.

Subcutaneous injections do not break the fast; neither does the use of a nutritious enema; nor even, in all probability, the artificial washing of the stomach with a gastric pump. However, most authors do not justify the washing of the stomach with a nutritious liquid, nor with a pump charged with oil, butter, or similar material; for in such cases, it would seem that there would be all the elements of the act of eating or drinking.

3. It is required, finally, that the object swallowed shall be *digestible.* It makes very little difference whether or not it is a medicine, or whether or not it has any nutritive value; *anything that is digestible breaks the fast,* even if the stomach rejects it immediately.

Chemistry can tell us most certainly whether an object is digestible or not; but in practice it is allowed to go by the common appreciation of things, even tho it is less sure.[347]

We may, therefore, regard as *not digestible:* metals, stone, glass, dry wood, hair, finger nails (in spite of the contrary opinion of modern chemists), threads of silk or wool, the pits of fruits, etc.

---

345. The absorption, even involuntary, of a considerable quantity of water, breaks the fast because it is a special vital act in which it is impossible to see a mere swallowing *per modum salivae.* On the other hand, when the quantity is insignificant, it is the intention alone which makes of its absorption a separate act.

346. However, unless there is a legitimate excuse, it would be a venial sin, because of the unseemliness of the act, to chew tobacco before receiving Communion.

347. In case of difference between the dictum of science and common opinion, we may follow this rule: if chemistry *proves* that a substance is not digestible, we may, in spite of the common opinion, follow that judgment; if common opinion regards a certain matter as not digestible, we may follow it in practice, in spite of the contrary opinion of scientists.

The following are *digestible:* pieces of bone, beeswax, earth, chalk, green wood, linen threads, gum, paper (in all probability), etc.

301. Exceptions from the law of fast.—Besides special permissions which may be obtained from the Holy See, there are circumstances when it is allowed to receive Communion without fasting[348]:

1. In cases where abstention from Communion would cause scandal or bring disgrace; such would be the case where a person would recall the fact that he was not fasting only when he was at the Communion rail, and would fear arousing suspicion if he were to withdraw without communicating.

2. To prevent the profanation of the Sacred Species, in case of fire or of an anti-Eucharistic demonstration; provided that it is not easy to put them in a safe place.

3. In case of danger of death (cf. n. 288).

4. In case of sickness that lasts for a month without hope of speedy recovery (cf. n. 333).

NOTE.—We may regard as probable the opinion advanced by reputable theologians (Gasparri, *de Euch., II, n. 1129; Cappello, n. 517),* according to which the faithful whose health does not permit them to keep the natural fast, may fulfill their Easter duty without fasting. A precept of the ecclesiastical law must not hinder the observation of a precept of the divine law. However, great care must be taken to avoid abuse in this matter, and to avoid likewise the danger of scandal; the advice of the confessor is to be followed in the whole matter.

No. 2.—Other Bodily Dispositions

302. Both the divine and the ecclesiastical law require that the Holy Eucharist shall be received with respect and with an external attitude that is in conformity with the sentiments of the soul.

It is commonly admitted that men must receive Communion with their heads bared, and without weapons. Respect demands, on the contrary, that women shall have their heads covered.[349] All

348. For exceptions to the law of the Eucharistic fast for the *celebrant,* cf. n. 85 et seq.

349. Here is a notice which was recently posted up in all the churches of Rome by order of the Cardinal-Vicar: "Women must not enter the house of God unless decently clothed in high-necked dresses, and unless their heads are covered; for immodesty in dress, everywhere and always reprehensible, is particularly offensive in the sanctity of the temple, *forbids access to Communion,* gives scandal to the faithful, and provokes terrible punishments from God."

must wear neat and modest clothing; and in the Latin Church, they must receive the consecrated Host kneeling. However, with the exception of the head-covering, there is no formal prescription on these various points; we must look to the prevalent custom for guidance, and any reasonable cause would excuse a derogation from these rules.

303. Either out of respect for the Blessed Sacrament, or for the purpose of preventing astonishment or disgust on the part of the faithful, it is to be recommended that those who are afflicted with a very noticeable bodily defect, or who are laboring under a contagious disease, shall not ask for Communion in public. It is quite evident, of course, that an external defect does not in any wise hinder the abundant reception of supernatural graces; but it may be, at times, a disturbance to the community, and that is sufficient reason for asking the person who is thus afflicted to receive Communion by himself, or to abstain from communicating. For the same reason, that is, to avoid disgusting the congregation, a priest who is afflicted with leprosy may not say Mass in public.

304. Most authors hold that, even after having secured absolution from a mortal sin of impurity committed that very day,[350] it would be a venial sin to receive Communion, unless there be a reasonable excuse (the fear of scandal or any other just motive). This doctrine does not seem admissible to us, except in cases where the sin has left behind it impure disturbances in mind or senses.

In practice, one should abide by the rubric of the Missal, which demands that each case shall be submitted to the judgment of the confessor, who is better fitted than anyone else to know what is for the spiritual advantage of his penitent.

305. It may happen also that these troublesome thoughts or disturbances of the senses may come from an accident that is entirely natural *(id est, pollutio involuntaria),* or from a sin that is only a venial sin, or again from acts that are perfectly lawful (v.g., *actus conjugalis). If this disturbance persists,* respect for the Eucharist demands that an effort be made to remove it; and in some cases it might be preferable (although there is no strict obligation) to refrain from receiving Communion.

The same holds true of dreams or disorders of the imagination that occur sometimes during sleep, and which, of themselves, do

350. *Agitur de pollutione mortaliter mala, vel de fornicatione, vel de alio peccato luxuriae consummato.*

not stand in the way of the devotion that is due the Blessed Sacrament.

NOTE.—Quoad conjuges affirmari debet quod neque conjugi reddenti, neque conjugi petenti debitum (etiam causa voluptatis), prohibetur sub levi, eadem die, sacra Communio. Nam, ex una parte, debitum reddere est actus virtutis; ex alia parte, copula conjugalis est licita, etiamsi habeatur causa voluptatis, modo non excludatur generatio prolis. Ergo licita quoque remanet sacra Communio.

Immo, per se, neque de consilio omittenda est a conjugibus Communio (nam semper habetur justa causa communicandi), sed tantum propter quamdam perturbationem adhuc manentem.

306. After Communion, everything is to be avoided which is not in keeping with the respect demanded by the Presence of Our Lord. It is proper, in particular, to refrain from spitting, or from eating and drinking, for ten or fifteen minutes, that is, during the space of time which is usually consecrated to thanksgiving. There might be a sin in the first case (spitting), if there were any danger of rejecting portions of the consecrated species (a very improbable thing). As for the second case (eating and drinking), all authors agree that any reason (fatigue, travel, the observance of the rule of a community, etc.) is sufficient to justify eating or drinking immediately after Communion.

On the other hand, it would be a mortal sin to have the stomach washed while there remains any serious danger of rejecting the Sacred Species. It is generally advisable to wait for several hours; for a sick stomach sometimes takes two or three hours to digest a small host. Digestion is ordinarily accelerated if, after Communion, a certain quantity of food is taken.

Article III.—The Communion of Children[351]

307. We have already seen (n. 281) that the obligation of receiving Communion at Easter, as laid down by the Church, applies to all the faithful, *as soon as they have reached the age of discretion.*

This is not a recent law, since it merely reproduces the command issued by the 4th Council of Lateran. But theologians were far

351. We shall devote a special article to this question, because of its importance, and because of recent modifications which have been introduced into the customs of certain countries, and in order to make very clear the dispositions which are required of the young communicants.

from agreeing amongst themselves on the meaning of the words, "the age of discretion."[352] Some construed them as meaning the age of puberty; others, as the age when the intellect is sufficiently developed to have an exact idea of the Eucharistic mystery; some fixed that age at twelve years, and as that age permitted the giving to children of a more complete doctrinal formation, it was sanctioned in many countries, by diocesan regulations.

Nevertheless, many theologians called attention to the fact that this delay was not in conformity with the law of the Church, and while admitting the advisability of such regulations for solemn and general Communions, they demanded that children should be admitted singly to the Holy Table, as soon as they understood the nature of this great act (Genicot, II, n. 210).

This was already the viewpoint of the Church. She has made it very clear in our own days; she has condemned regulations and customs which are contrary to the general discipline, and she has, by means of the decree *Quam singulari* of the S. Congregation of the Sacraments (Aug. 8, 1910), made it easy for children to fulfill their duty. She has likewise confirmed[353] this decree by the Canons which, in the *Codex,* regulate this most important question. Here are the chief points.

No. 1.—The Age for Communion

308. The *Codex* declares in the first place that it is not allowed to give Communion to tiny children, that is, to those whom the infirmity of their age prevents from having even an imperfect knowledge or even a vague desire of Communion (c. 854, No. 1). This, as is plain, is a disciplinary prescription; in the first centuries, the Church permitted the giving of Communion even to

352. The Holy Eucharist is not necessary *necessitate medii,* and it is the Church who specifies the moment when the precept of Christ begins to bind. While reminding the faithful, in a general way, of the obligation which compels all who have reached the age of reason to receive the Holy Eucharist, and while it had never approved the contrary custom which existed in certain countries, it had not, up to our own times, formally condemned it, perhaps because of special difficulties, or because of the relative advantages which it offered little children especially regarding catechetical instruction. Pius X, on the other hand, was of the opinion that these reasons were not now sufficient to justify this practice, and thought that the time had come to make children and adults alike subject to the law of the Council of Lateran.

353. For it is not true that the prescriptions of the *Codex* are a derogation from those of the decree *Quam singulari;* only the viewpoint of the legislator is a trifle different. The *Decree* aimed in a special manner at destroying the error of those who put off to an unduly advanced age the Communion of children; the *Codex* aimed at correcting the opposite abuse. the error of those who, forgetting the conditions for admission to Communion, as indicated by the Decree, would admit without any preparation, all children to Communion. Therefore it makes a distinction between those children who are in good health and those who are in danger of death.

tiny children. Since the date when the Eucharist was no longer given under the two species, this custom has fallen into desuetude; the *Codex* formally prohibits it, and under pain of mortal sin. In our days children are not permitted to receive Communion before they have reached the age of reason.

As we have seen, it is difficult to know at just what moment the age of discretion begins. It is evident also that this discretion of the mind has its degrees, and the Church has this in mind when she lays down the precept of receiving Communion; and so the dispositions required of the child vary *according as the child is or is not in danger of death.*

309. When a child is in danger of death, that is, when it is suffering from a disease or has met with an accident that *endangers its life,* in order that it may be permitted to receive Communion, it is enough if it can distinguish the Eucharistic bread from ordinary bread and can receive it with the respect and other dispositions that are in keeping with its age, without any inquiry being made as to whether or not it knows the other great religious truths. When these conditions are realized, it is a *matter of obligation* to give Communion to children, for, according to all theologians, they are bound by the precept of the Savior.

310. If the child is not in danger of death, the Church requires more perfect dispositions both of the intellect and of the will, that is, a certain knowledge of Christian Doctrine, and a more thorough preparation, calculated to develop their piety towards this august sacrament.

But it would be an error to believe that the Church demands a complete knowledge of the truths of religion, or even a comparatively deep knowledge, or a preparation which is ordinarily incompatible with the frivolity of tender years. The *Codex* demands only a *greater* knowledge and a *more thorough* preparation than for children who are in danger of death. And we have already seen that the dispositions required for these latter do not demand very much.

Moreover, the *Codex* gives an explanation of the extent of that knowledge and of the intensity of that preparation. The child "must know, according to its capacity, those mysteries of faith *whose knowledge is necessary 'necessitate medii'.*" Therefore, it must know that God exists and that he will render to every man according to his works, that in God there are three persons sub-

sisting in one nature, and that one of these persons, the Son of God, became man to save us.[354] This knowledge must be proportioned to the intellectual capacity of the child, and therefore it may be extremely summary and superficial.

As regards devotion, the *Codex* demands that the child shall receive the Eucharist, with piety, it is true, but with a piety which is in proportion to its age, *pro suae aetatis modulo*. This Latin diminutive indicates very plainly that even very imperfect dispositions will suffice, and that the child is not to be required to manifest a recollection and ardor of which it is incapable.[355]

311. It follows from these explanations that the Church does not require in children the full use of reason; it suffices if they have *a certain use* of reason which permits them to distinguish good from evil, and which consequently makes it possible for them to commit sin.[356] It was the intention even of the Council of Trent to have children receive Communion as soon as they were exposed to the danger of losing sanctifying grace.

But at what age do children begin to have this use of reason? According to the *Codex* (c. 88, No. 3), it is to be *presumed* at the age of seven years completed. This was the rule formulated in the decree *Quam singulari:* "the age of discretion, both for confession and for Communion, is that at which the child begins to reason, that is, *about seven years*. It is at this moment that the obligation begins to bind concerning the fulfillment of the twofold precept of confession and Communion[357]" (No. 1).

354. Not all theologians hold that *explicit* faith in the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation are required *necessitate medii* for salvation. This is still another reason for not exacting precise ideas on this matter from children.

355. A child has a "taste for the Eucharist," according to Mgr. de Segur, when he "loves Jesus and desires Him;" according to St. Thomas, "when he begins to conceive for this sacrament a *devotion* that is in proportion to his age."

The *Codex*, as is plain, has made no change in the doctrine of the Decree *Quam Singulari*. It would seem, on the contrary, to have facilitated, in certain points, the practice indicated by the Decree, since, for children who are in danger of death, it does not require even the knowledge of the great truths of faith.

356. According to a reply from Cardinal Gasparri (cf. Annales des Prêtres Adorateurs, February, 1921), the use of reason in question is such as is sufficient for the commission of venial sin; in order to be permitted to receive Communion, the child need not be capable of committing a mortal sin. It is true that many authors, with St. Thomas (Ia. IIae, q. 89, a. 6), do not admit that a child is capable of committing a venial sin before he is capable of committing a mortal sin. But this only goes to show that we are not to require of the child the full use of reason.

357. It is plain, therefore, that it would be contrary to the mind and the will of the Church to make a distinction between the age required for confession and the age required for Communion. There is only one age of reason, the age when the child begins to discern good from evil; and this age marks the commencement of the obligation to go to confession and to receive Communion. Moreover, in No. 7, the Decree condemns the custom of not admitting children to confession, or of not giving them absolution, when they have reached the age of reason.

We may hold, then, as a general rule, that it is about the age of seven years that a child begins to be bound by the precept of Communion. There is nothing absolute, however, about this indication; the use of reason may come before or after this age, and it is this, and *this alone* which conditions *the precept* and *the right* to communicate. When a child who possesses the knowledge and the piety of which we have just spoken, begins to reason, he *may* and *must*[358] receive Communion, whether he is eight years old, or seven, or six, or even younger.—But in a case where there would be some doubt concerning the intellectual development of a child, his age would help to determine his right and his duty to receive Communion. *Unless there is proof to the contrary,* the presumption is that after the close of the seventh year the child has the use of reason, and therefore may and must receive Communion; and that before that age, he has not the necessary and sufficient dispositions to approach the Holy Table.

No. 2.—Concerning the Determination of the Dispositions of the Child and His Admission to Communion

512. Confessors and parents, or those who occupy their place (grandparents and tutors), have the right to decide whether the child has the proper dispositions for Communion (c. 854, No. 4). For they are the ones who are in a position to know best the intimate sentiments of the child and to judge of the development of his intellect.

Nevertheless the *Codex* does not say that other persons may not render decisions in this matter.

The pastor of the parish has as his duty to see that children shall not approach the Holy Table before the age of discretion, or without the required dispositions; and in order to make certain of these things, he may, if he sees fit, subject them to an examination. It is also his duty to see that those who come to the age

---

358. It is true that according to the *Codex* (c. 12), *ecclesiastical laws* do not bind children until they have completed their seventh year, even tho they may enjoy the use of reason before that. But this canon also contains the following restriction: "unless the law expressly stipulates the contrary." And this contrary stipulation is found in Canon 859, No. 1, regarding Communion, and in Canon 906, regarding confession.

Moreover, the precept of the Easter Communion is at one and the same time of divine and of ecclesiastical law; it is God who commands us to receive Communion, and it is the Church who explains and defines at what age we must receive Communion.

of reason and who have the required dispositions shall receive this divine food as early as possible (c. 854, No. 5).

313. There is no ground, it seems to us, for deducing from this text the *exclusive right* of the pastor to admit children to their First Communion. Strictly speaking, there is no question of right as applying to either the pastor or the parents; a right exists only as regards the child; as soon as he reaches the age of reason and possesses the required dispositions, he has the right and the duty to receive Communion. But, left to himself, he would not think of fulfilling this duty; it therefore pertains to those who have charge of him to bring him to the Holy Table.[359] Ordinarily the confessor and the parents have knowledge of these dispositions, and the pastor, having no reason to suspect their intentions, should rely on their judgment. However, if the pastor had serious doubts concerning the discretion or the dispositions of the child (a supposition which is most improbable in cases where the confessor has given his decision), he may take steps to clear up these doubts;[360] this would be in keeping with his duty of vigilance over the spiritual life of his parish and the regular administration of the sacraments.

The parents would act wisely in consulting with the pastor.

---

359. The child, by the very fact of his being baptized, has a right to the Holy Eucharist; consequently, his admission to the Holy Table cannot be, in the strict sense of the word, a permission to receive Communion; it can be nothing more than a simple declaration made to him concerning his right, a declaration which he might well do without if he were capable of managing his own affairs. Moreover, to make this declaration, to give him this counsel, it is not necessary to have authority over him; and theologians teach that in default of confessor and parents, any prudent person may give this advice to the child. The director of the college where he is studying may discharge this office, and may even disregard any prohibition which is issued on this matter by the child's parents. But in a general way it is the parents who are chiefly responsible concerning the First Communion of their children; their intervention is normal and well nigh indispensable. (Nouv. Rev. Theolo. November, 1921).

360. We do not hold, therefore, the opinion according to which the admission of the child must always include a twofold consultation, the judgment in the internal forum of the confessor and of the parents, and the official appeal to the pastor in the forum externum, after an examination. We believe that in general the pastor should leave to the confessor and to the parents the duty of deciding as to the dispositions of the child; his role is one of high general surveillance; he must check abuses. But this right of surveillance does not include the right to mix in all the affairs he has to inspect, any more than the right of the Bishop to inspect the books that are printed in his diocese permits him to compel all the publishers to submit to him *all* the books they put in circulation. The pastor should urge the parents on more often than hold them back; in any case, he cannot require *all* the children of the parish to undergo an examination before being admitted to Communion. It is only in cases where he has reason to fear some negligence or abuse that he can and should take steps to inquire as to the dispositions of the child.

It is needless to add that this examination should always be made with all kindness and gentleness; it is never permitted to refuse publicly and to the accompaniment of harsh words to give Communion to a child under the pretext of not being certain of his age or dispositions, just as tho he were a public sinner or *infamis*.

But this is not a formal obligation;[361] and the pastor cannot even require the children to make their First Communion in their own parish.—To sum up, therefore: the role of the pastor is to prevent abuses (unduly precocious or unduly delayed Communions), to see that the canonical precepts are observed, either as regards the dispositions demanded of the young communicants, or as regards their obligation to receive Communion. *In doubtful cases,* it is the right of the pastor to decide after due examination of the child in question.

314. It is also the duty of the pastor to give his best efforts—preferably during Lent, if that is possible,—to prepare little children who have come to the age of reason to receive for the first time the Easter Communion to which they are bound in common with the rest of the faithful (c. 859, No. 1, c. 1330, 2).

315. The obligation to receive Communion binds the child from the day when he begins to have the use of reason; he is not, however, obliged to receive Communion immediately; it is at Easter time that he, like the rest of the faithful, must receive Communion. And so, the child who attains the use of reason in the month of July, may wait until the Easter time of the next year to receive Communion.

No. 3.—The Obligations of the Parents, of the Confessor, of the Pastor, etc.

316. So long as children have not reached the age of puberty (fourteen years for boys, and twelve for girls), the obligation of the precept of Communion binds also *and in a special manner* those who have charge of them, that is, parents, guardians, confessors, teachers, and the pastor (c. 860).

Because of the immature and unreflecting nature of children, those who have any authority over them must remind them of the duties of the Christian life, and above all, of the duty of receiving Communion.

317. This obligation,—a grave obligation because of its object,—binds first of all the parents or the grandparents (c. 750, No. 2, 2), who are obliged to train their children in their religious

361. When it is a question of *solemn* Communion, the diocesan regulations may give the pastor the right to admit children to Communion. But this does not refer to the admission to the Holy Table, strictly speaking, but to some external circumstance which has to do with the government of the parish, which of course pertains to the pastor

duties; if they fail, it falls on those who occupy their place, that is, on guardians.

The confessor must instruct his penitents concerning their particular obligations, and hence must remind those children who come to him and who have the required dispositions, of their duty to receive Communion as early as possible. In certain cases, he would even be bound to directly prepare these children for Communion, if a brief instruction would suffice for this purpose.

Teachers, of no matter what kind, are only the helpers and the instruments of the parents; in the name of those whose place they occupy, they are bound to give their pupils the religious instruction that is necessary for them; and this includes their duties toward the Holy Eucharist.

It is hardly necessary to state that the *pastor* (and the same is true of *vicarii* of all classes), who is the spiritual father of his parishioners, is bound to furnish the young with the aids which they have a right to expect from him and which they find most particularly in Communion.[362]

---

362. On November 30, 1910, in the *Monitore Ecclesiastico,* Cardinal Gennari gave the following decisions:

When a child who has reached the age of reason does not go to confession and does not receive Communion, the following persons are guilty of sin (except, of course, when there are excusing circumstances, ignorance, prejudice, etc.):

1:—The child himself, in the measure in which he evinces malice in his abstention. Ordinarily this would not be grave.

2:—The parents; in neglecting to see, either on their own behalf or thru someone else that their children do their duty, they sin mortally against natural piety.

3:—The confessors commit in this one case, two mortal sins, one against the formal precept of the Decree, and the other against charity.

4:—Teachers are bound, *in solidum et sub gravi,* together with the parents, by virtue of the quasi-contract which binds them in justice, to enable the children to fulfill their duties.

5:—Pastors also commit mortal sin in the same circumstances.

We must admit that the gravity of this duty does not seem to be sufficiently understood in some places. Too much attention has been paid to the difficulties of practical realization, not enough confidence has been shown, and many children wait entirely too long for the bread which might preserve their souls from death, and which Our Lord and His Church commands us to give them.

It is true that oftentimes, to justify delaying Communion until a later age, the pretext is alleged that without such delay it is impossible to give the child the religious instruction which is indispensable for its salvation. Let us remark in the first place that we should say "difficulty" rather than "impossiblity;" early Communion, putting things in their very worst light, will take away from the Catechism classes only a small number of children who in all probability would not have persevered any longer if they had been made to wait for a later Communion. Moreover, this catechetical instruction is not the sole and indispensable means of learning the mysteries of faith. Besides, the pretext alleged was not ignored by the legislator, and the Decree *Quam singulari* has stated that it is not enough to justify delayed Communions. "Even though the children were to prepare for their First Communion by a more serious study—which is not always the case—there would be none the less reason to deplore the loss of their first innocence, which might perhaps have been avoided by the reception of the Holy Eucharist in their tender years."

Article IV.—Frequent and Daily Communion

By frequent Communion, we mean Communion several times a week. By daily Communion, we mean Communion received *habitually* every day, even tho a day or two may be missed from time to time.

No. 1.—The Doctrine

318. It is the wish of Our Lord and of His Church that the faithful should receive Communion frequently, and even daily.

This is no new doctrine. It would be an error to believe that it dates back only to the decree *Sacra Tridentina Synodus.* All the Fathers of the Church have recommended it, and the practice of the faithful for many centuries was to approach the Holy Table every time they assisted at Mass. Indeed, they were oftentimes permitted to keep the Holy Eucharist in their homes that they might the more easily receive it in the ages of persecution or during the invasions of the barbarians.

The Councils repeat the same doctrine. In the first centuries, they went so far as to excommunicate those who pretended to assist at Mass without receiving Communion. When the fervor of the faithful began to cool, they multiplied their exhortations and recommendations. The Council of Trent "exhorts, beseeches, and conjures all and each of those who bear the name of Christians . . . . to manifest their faith and piety by frequently receiving this heavenly bread; it desires that at every Mass those who are present shall make not merely a spiritual Communion, but a sacramental Communion" (Sess. XIII, c. 8, XXII, c. 6).

This proves that Pius X was only the echo of all Tradition, when he proposed to *all Christians,* of whatever rank and condition they may be, the ideal of frequent and daily Communion. (Decree *Sacra Tridentina Synodus, I).*

319. Therefore the *Codex* demands that "the faithful shall be urged to receive Communion often, even daily, according to the rules laid down by the decrees of the Holy See; when they assist at Holy Mass, they are to be advised not to be content with spiritual Communion, but to receive sacramental Communion with the requisite dispositions" (c. 863).

It would, therefore, be going against the spirit and the will of the Church, not only to systematically refuse frequent Communion to the faithful, but even to fail to invite them to communicate

often, to distribute Communion only on Sundays and holydays, or to demand from the faithful dispositions more perfect than are required by the decree of Pius X.

No. 2.—The Dispositions Required

320. This point in particular has been the subject of numerous controversies which, however, are now closed by the decree *Sacra Tridentina Synodus.*

The Church had never demanded unusual fervor as a requisite for frequent Communion. In the 17th century, certain bishops interdicted frequent Communion because of abuses which had crept into their dioceses. Innocent XI condemned this prohibition. And the decree *Cum ad aures* mentions but one condition as necessary for daily Communion, namely, freedom from mortal sin.

Under the influence of the Jansenist heresy, the greater part of theologians adopted a more rigorous attitude. To the state of grace, they added other conditions of fitness or worthiness, which seemed to be required under pain of venial sin, and which became more rigorously required in proportion to the frequency of the Communions. After the example of St. Liguori *(Praxis,* n. 418 et seq.), they permitted frequent Communion to those who had already attained a certain degree of piety, who cultivated the habit of mental prayer, and who rarely committed fully deliberate sins; but they granted daily Communion only to those who were free from all affection to even venial sins, and who had already given proof of their desire to attain the higher stages of perfection.—This was making frequent Communion depend on conditions of worthiness, making a reward out of what Our Lord established particularly as a remedy for human frailty.

321. The decree of Pius X had as its principal purpose to make it clear that all these secondary conditions of fitness, in spite of their acknowledged utility, must not be exacted as necessary for frequent or daily Communion.

In accordance with the decree, then, we must distinguish between the *necessary* and the *useful* dispositions. To be permitted to receive Communion daily, there are only two conditions *necessary:* the state of grace, and the right intention.

322. The faithful should often be reminded of the grave ob-

ligation of not approaching the Holy Table without having received sacramental absolution, when they have had the misfortune to commit a mortal sin.

On the other hand, the decree does not require a habitual and persevering state of grace; it is enough if we are in the state of grace at the moment when we receive Communion.[363]

It is not even necessary to be absolutely certain that we are at peace with God; it is enough if we are not certain that we have lost sanctifying grace by a mortal sin committed since our last confession.

323. The second necessary condition is the right intention "which consists in this, that the communicant acts not thru routine nor thru vanity nor for human reasons, but that he receives Communion in order to please God, to unite himself to God more intimately thru charity, and to make use of this divine remedy for his infirmities and failings" (Decree, II).

We must, then, put aside all human considerations, custom, vain glory, human respect, material advantage,[364] and receive Communion in order to please God and to make ourselves better. But it is not necessary that the communicant propose these motives or any one of them explicitly to himself; an implicit intention is enough, and such an intention is always present in one who has resolved to approach the Holy Table because he knows the treasures of the Eucharist. For him a right intention is in some way permanent and habitual.

324. Such, then, are the two necessary and sufficient conditions for frequent and daily Communion, and for Easter Communion as well. From this point of view, there is no distinction to be made between these two kinds of Communion. When these two dispositions are present in a soul,—and they are within the reach of every soul that possesses good will,—it can with profit receive daily Communion. Anyone who is in a state where he is

363. The state of grace supposes, moreover, the firm and sincere purpose never to sin again; but this firm purpose does not exclude the natural inclination to sin which comes from the frailty of human nature, and for which Communion is the best remedy.

364. The Decree refers to the deliberate and wilful intentions and not to the involuntary impressions from which even the best souls cannot entirely free themselves. To sin mortally thru lack of right intention, one must formally exclude the special ends of the Eucharist and receive Communion *solely* thru routine, vain glory, or with the intention of attaining an end that is bad or purely human. When a natural and imperfect motive, like habit, enters as a secondary motive into the decision of the communicant, his intention, altho less pure, is not thereby vitiated.

permitted to receive Communion every month, is in a state where he may receive every day.[365]

325. Is this to be taken as meaning that the Church does not urge us to bring to Holy Communion more than usually perfect dispositions? There is no question but that she reminds us that "it is very desirable that those who receive Communion frequently or daily shall be free from venial sins, at least from those which are fully deliberate, and from all affection to these sins," and these are the *useful* dispositions of which we spoke above; *but* the absence of these dispositions must not keep the faithful from approaching the Holy Table. "For it is there," adds the Decree, "that they will find the strength to rid themselves little by little from venial sins and from all affection for those sins" (III).

The Church, therefore, far from bidding us to make light of venial sin, gives us, on the contrary, the best means whereby to rid ourselves of it. But the decree of Pius X condemns the doctrine of those theologians who see a venial sin in the act of receiving Communion with venial sins upon our conscience, or with the *habitual* affection for those sins.[366]

No. 3.—The Role of the Confessor

326. "In order that frequent and daily Communion may be received with more prudence and more merit, the advice of the confessor should be asked. But the confessor must take care not

365. "The essential preparation which the presence within us of Our Lord in His sacramental condition demands, is not superior to the disposition required for the substantial presence of the divinity itself within our souls; if the state of grace is enough for the permanent habitation of the Trinity within us, why is it not enough, for the same reason, for the daily reception of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ?" (Hugon, O.P., La Sainte Eucharistie, p. 206).

366. Slight sins, committed before or after Communion, for instance, lack of resistance to distractions or to vain thoughts, do not prevent us from having a right intention, and from receiving Communion with much fruit.

Nevertheless, it would be a sin, at least a venial sin, to receive Communion without attention and without showing respect in our attitude, or, for the same reason, to retain, at the moment of receiving Communion, a voluntary and *actual* affection for even a venial sin.

Certain authors go so far as to say that the preparation for Communion and the thanksgiving after Communion were only of counsel and were intended merely to procure more abundant graces for us. It is true, of course, if we have in mind a prolonged preparation or thanksgiving; but it would be an error to say this if we meant that receiving Communion required no preparation and no thanksgiving; for in this course of action there would be a lack of respect for the Holy Eucharist, which would in itself constitute a venial sin.

This does not prevent us from admitting with St. Thomas (In IV sent. dist. 12, q. 3, a. 2) that "it is better, *simpliciter loquendo*, to communicate than to abstain, however short the preparation may be," or with St. Liguori, that "Communion must never be omitted for the reason that there is no time to prepare for it, when the time has been employed in works of charity" (The True Spouse of Christ, ch. xviii, No. 25, n. 6).

to forbid frequent or daily Communion to any penitent who is in the state of grace and who desires to receive Communion with a right intention" (Decree, V).

From this passage we cannot conclude the absolute necessity of the advice of the confessor in order to receive Communion frequently. "This advice," says Cardinal Gennari, "is not imposed by any precept." "It is certain," adds Ferreres, "that if anyone is in the state of grace and has a right intention, he may receive Communion without committing any positive sin, even tho he does not ask the advice of his confessor. But, in order to guard against illusions, and to cultivate the humility and the spirit of submission that are becoming in the Christian, it is better and more perfect to allow oneself to be simply guided by the advice of the confessor." It is, therefore, a measure of prudence which the decree recommends; to consult one's confessor is more meritorious and less dangerous than to mark out one's course for himself.[367]

After all, the authority which the decree confers on the confessor is not an authority of jurisdiction. The confessor is judge only as regards the forgiving or retaining of sins, and as regards the imposing of a penance. For anything else, he has only an authority of declaration or direction; he indicates the scope of the law, and points out the various results which a certain step may entail. As a doctor, he may remind his penitent of the *obligation* of removing a scandal, or making restitution, or removing an occasion of sin before receiving Communion. As a director, he passes judgment, in accordance with the state of soul of his penitent, on the advantages or disadvantages which frequent Communion may possess for him. It is easy to see, therefore, the imprudence of not following his advice.

But, on the other hand, the confessor must not exceed his role of doctor, with regard to these souls which possess the *necessary*

367. May a person receive Communion daily, in spite of the contrary advice of his confessor? As a general rule, it would be imprudent, perhaps even a downright sin to do this, especially if this line of conduct indicated contempt for the authority of the confessor. For the latter is ordinarily better acquainted with the conscience of the penitent than even the penitent himself, and for this reason it would be very imprudent to *habitually* ignore his direction. However, since the advice of the confessor is only a counsel, a penitent who is not conscious of any mortal sin may in a particular case, use the right given him by the Decree, in spite of the contrary opinion of the confessor.

When there is opposition between the opinions of two confessors who are equally acquainted with the conscience of a penitent, the latter may, without scruple, follow the advice of the one who allows him the greater number of Communions.

dispositions. He has no right, as a general rule,[368] to bar them from the Holy Table; nay more, it is his duty, together with pastors and preachers, to frequently and earnestly urge the faithful to adopt the pious and salutary practice of frequent Communion (art. VI). "It would be a sin to fail to do this," says Cardinal Gennari.

Sometimes he may advise certain penitents to abstain occasionally from Communion; for some souls this abstention may have advantages. Ordinarily, however, as St. Thomas says, and, after him, the commentators on the Decree, "it is better to communicate than to abstain."

The confessor has no right, as a general rule, to forbid frequent Communion to those who often relapse into deliberate venial sins, or who retain an affection for those sins. But frequent and *unopposed* relapses into the same deliberate sins, even tho they be venial sins, are ordinarily a proof that such souls have not the required dispositions, and are for the confessor a motive for refraining from recommending, or even for positively forbidding too frequent Communions (Lehmkuhl, n. 212). "It is not possible," says the Decree, "that by receiving Communion every day with the required dispositions, one can fail to rid himself little by little from even venial sins and from the affection for these sins" (III).

No. 4.—Practical Conclusions

327. Pastors, confessors, and preachers, must recommend the practice of frequent and daily Communion to all the faithful, of whatever rank, or condition, or age. For all, Communion is the great means of santification; there must be no distinction, *in principle,* between men and women, between married and single persons, between the old and the young. But great care must be taken to see that all come to the Holy Table with the required dispositions.

328. The Decree *Quam singulari* (n. VI) "makes it a duty for all who have charge of children to strive to bring them to the Holy Table as early as possible, and even daily after their First Communion, in order to correspond with the desires of Jesus and His Church."

---

368. By exception, the confessor may forbid frequent Communion, if the penitent cannot follow this pious practice without detriment to the duties of his state or to some other grave obligation.

The objection is sometimes raised that children are incapable of a proper preparation. This is an error, for the Decree requires only such devotion as is in keeping with their age, and such preparation as befits their character and condition. It is possible that they may not understand all the grandeur of the Eucharistic mystery; but they are capable of loving Jesus, and this love must be implanted in their young hearts before the development of their passions.

329. Many people hesitate or refuse to receive Communion because they have not gone to confession for a certain length of time, a week, two weeks, or three weeks.

The confessor, who knows their habitual state of conscience, should reassure them by reminding them that confession, according to the Council of Trent, is obligatory, before Communion, only in one case, namely, when one is certain of having committed a mortal sin.

Apart from this case, recourse to the sacrament of Penance may be very useful in purifying the soul, in increasing our sorrow for our sins, in securing direction and wise counsel; but if it is not easy or convenient to go to confession, that is no reason for staying away from Holy Communion.[369] In the early ages, Christians confessed only their mortal sins; and the faithful of these times should know that there are other means besides confession for obtaining the remission of venial sins, and that it is better to receive Communion every day, provided we are free from mortal sin, than to refrain from receiving Communion under the pretext that we have not gone to confession for a long time.

330. Another proof of this doctrine is found in the fact that the *Codex* (c. 931, No. 3) has confirmed the privilege granted by Pius X to those who received Communion daily, regarding the gaining of indulgences. "The faithful who receive Communion daily with the required dispositions, even tho they may abstain once or twice a week from Communion, without special reason, can gain, without going to confession, all those indulgences which ordinarily suppose confession, except the indulgences of the Jubilee or those which are granted in the form of a Jubilee."

It follows from this concession that, in the mind of the Church, daily Communion does not even suppose confession every two

369. According to St. Thomas (IIIa, q. 84, a 5 & 6) we have a *normal* need of Communion, which is the food of our soul, and we have only an *accidental* need of confession, when we have the misfortune to commit a mortal sin.

weeks. To be sure, we are not to see in this an encouragement to abstain from going to confession; pious persons who receive Communion daily, usually go to confession every week, or at least every two weeks, and the Church approves and recommends this practice of devotion.

331. Priests (pastors, preachers, or confessors), while urging their people to receive frequently and even daily, must often remind them of the dispositions *which frequent and daily Communion demands;* they must make the people see that its effects depend, in large measure, on the piety and fervor of the communicant; and they must insist that each individual shall prepare as well as possible for this great act and follow it with a fitting thanksgiving.

One of the most efficacious means of promoting frequent Communion, of insuring its fruitfulness and preventing sacrileges, is to offer the faithful the greatest possible facilities for making their confessions.

332. While frequent Communion is, as a general rule, to be recommended to all the faithful, the Decree urges its particular promotion and propagation in religious institutes of every kind, in seminaries, and in all houses of Christian education (VII).

Henceforth, in all Institutes, whether of simple or of solemn vows, the rules or constitutions which set apart certain days for Communion must be regarded as *directive* in this matter, and in no wise as preceptive, that is, the number of Communions prescribed must be regarded as the minimum for the religious.[370]

Consequently, more frequent, and even daily access to the Eucharistic Table must be open to them, in accordance with the rules laid down by the Decree.[371]

Superiors (of men or women) are forbidden to limit the number of Communions of their religious. In only one case, namely, when a member of the community has given real scandal, or committed a grave external fault,[372] the Superior may forbid that person to approach the Holy Table before going to confession.

370. This passage of the Rule may be formulated in this fashion: "It is particularly recommended to receive Communion on the following days."

371. In order that all religious may well understand the tenor of the Decree, the Holy See commands the Superior of each house to have it read in the vulgar tongue every year in the community, during the octave of Corpus Christi.

372. These words must be given their full meaning, and that must not be called scandal which is only a defect of character or a slight infraction of the Rule.
It would certainly be a mortal sin for a Superior to limit the number of Communions fixed by the confessor.

It is the province of the confessor alone to *direct* his penitent as to the number of Communions. However, religious are not bound to inquire, every time they go to confession, concerning the number of Communions recommended or permitted; so long as their dispositions remain unchanged, they may follow the direction already given. They may also, in case of disagreement amongst confessors, follow the direction of the one who is more liberal regarding the number of Communions, provided the penitent is equally well known to both confessors.[373]

Article V.—Dispensation from Fast for the Sick

333. The Church wishes to make it easy for the sick to receive Communion often; this is proven by the privilege granted in the first instance by Pius X (S. C. C., Dec. 7, 1906), and renewed by the *Codex*.[374]

According to the terms of this privilege, "those sick persons who have been confined to their beds for one month, and who have no serious grounds for expecting a speedy recovery, may, if this is in accord with the prudent advice of their confessor, receive Holy Communion once or twice[375] a week without fasting, that is, after having taken a small quantity of *liquid* nourishment, or medicine (even solid medicine)" (c. 858, No. 2).

334. This dispensation supposes the following conditions:

1. It applies to the sick or infirm whose condition is prolonged for *a month*.[376] This word infers a duration of thirty days, but

373. If the Superior had grave reasons for thinking the number of Communions permitted excessive, he may refer the matter to the confessor, but in the event, it is the decision of the latter that must prevail. (Decree *Quemadmodum*, n. VI).

This Decree *Quemadmodum* seems to grant to confessors of religious men and women more authority than the Decree *Sacra Tridentina Synodus* gives to ordinary confessors; and it still remains in force (n. VII of the regulations of the Decree *Sacra Tridentina)*; but the advice to foster frequent Communions, especially in religious communities, shows in what spirit it must be understood and applied.

374. The concession of Pius X does not allow the taking of solid medicine. Moreover, it distinguishes between the sick who dwell in a house where the Blessed Sacrament is kept, and others; the former may receive Communion when not fasting twice in the week, the others twice in the month. The *Codex* has therefore enlarged the concession of Pius X.

375. This concession must not be extended beyond the fixed limits; it would be a mortal sin to receive Communion three or four times a week when not fasting.

On the contrary, there is nothing to prevent a sick person who observes the Eucharistic fast from receiving Communion every day at home.

Moreover, it is quite easy, for reasons which are serious but which do not compel the sick person to keep his bed, to obtain from the Holy See permission to receive Communion often, even daily, without fasting. For this recourse must be had to the Sacred Congregation of the Council thru the Ordinary.

376. There is no ground for attributing this privilege to those whose sickness is just beginning, even if it is morally certain that it will last for a month or more.

it is not necessary to take it in the absolute sense; at the end of *approximately* a month of sickness, that is, about the 27th or 28th day of enforced confinement within one's bedchamber, one may begin to make use of this privilege.

Moreover, the word "sick" applies not only to those who are suffering from a serious illness, but also to those whom old age, weakness, or any infirmity compels to keep their bed; and also, according to a declaration of the Sacred Congregation of the Council (March 6-25, 1907), those who cannot recline continually in bed, or who can rise for an hour or two every day. This privilege may be accorded to all those who are obliged to *habitually remain in bed or in the house.*

NOTE.—Some reputable authors (Cappello, n. 506; Ferreres, "Frequent Communion," n. 204; Vermeersch-Creusen, t. II, p. 70) hold that this concession applies to those who, while habitually keeping their room, can nevertheless go and receive Communion in a neighboring church, provided that the other conditions of the *Codex* are complied with, especially that which refers to the direction of the confessor.

We cannot withhold a certain measure of extrinsic probability from this opinion. But we confess that we cannot understand on what motives it is based; and it seems to us incompatible with the text of the Canon which it interprets, and with the declaration of the Sacred Congregation of the Council. This privilege is a derogation from a grave law, so grave that many authors deny the authorization to receive Communion when not fasting, even to satisfy the precept of the Paschal Communion. With much greater reason, therefore, it should be subject to a strict interpretation when it is a question of a mere Communion of devotion. Until the Holy See has pronounced on this question, we believe that the dispensation from the Eucharistic fast is granted only to the sick who receive Communion *at home.*[377]

2. It is required also that the sick have no certain hope of speedy convalescence. However, in order to void this privilege, it is not enough that there be a mere conjecture or vague probability of recovery; so long as the sick person is not *morally certain* of being able to leave the house within five or six days, he may in all security receive Communion when not fasting.

377. Cf. l'Ami du Clergé, 1924, p. 12; Monit. Eccl. Dec. 1, 1916. Remark also that sick priests can, like other Christians, make use of this privilege to receive Communion, but not to say Mass, without fasting.

3. Before making use of this privilege, the sick person must consult his confessor,[378] who is the sole judge in this matter, and who is bidden by the *Codex* to exercise great discretion in his decisions. The priest must consider the spiritual dispositions of his penitent and see that the conditions imposed by the Church are complied with.

He will bear in mind that the *Codex* does not exact from the sick man the moral impossibility of observing the Eucharistic fast; any serious inconvenience caused by fasting (v.g., fatigue —even tho only moderately grave—arising from fasting to a late hour in order to receive Communion), justifies the making use of the dispensation.[379]

4. Finally, the sick man is not permitted to take any solid food except a medicine[380] (v.g., a capsule, pills, tablets, etc.). For the Canon allows either medicine (of all kinds), or liquid nourishment. There is no obligation to be content with pure liquids. A decree of the Holy Office (Sept. 7, 1897) explained the words *"per modum potus"* by saying that it is allowed to take soup, bouillon, coffee, milk, or any other liquid nourishment, even when it contains another substance, like semolina, toast, bread crumbs, or beaten-up eggs, *provided that the mixture does not lose the characteristics of liquid nourishment.*

A boiled egg is evidently solid food; in its natural state it may be regarded as liquid food.[381]

Altho the *Codex* does not explicitly determine the quantity of nourishment allowed, the word *"liquid"* indicates quite plainly

---

378. The decree relating to frequent Communion requires the advice of the confessor only to insure a larger number of Communions; here, however, his decision refers to the very right to receive Communion without fasting.

379. The confessor can permit his penitent to receive Communion twice a week without fasting, even tho he were to receive Communion on the other days and fast while doing so. However, if fasting did not cause the sick person any fatigue or inconvenience, we do not see what would be the reason for the priest's recommending the use of the privilege.

380. We must not consider as medicine everything that is prescribed by a physician, (v.g., substantial food intended to restore the strength of the patient.) Medicine is intended to directly combat a disease.

Nevertheless a substance which might be food for a well man (v. g., oranges, lemons, grapes) might be a medicine for a sick man, provided that the physician recognizes its usefulness in resisting disease.

381. There is a controversy regarding certain substances (sugar, lozenges) which are allowed to melt in the mouth. Cappello, p. 507, allows their use by the sick. Other theologians hold that a food is *taken* as soon as it is introduced into the mouth; but this is rather improbable. We may, according to our way of thinking regard as taken *per modum potus* all that does not demand the effort of masticating in the mouth and the effort of swallowing to pass into the stomach.

that it is a question of a moderate quantity, sufficient to enable the sick person to wait until the time for Communion, but not enough to satisfy his hunger.

CHAPTER V

Concerning the Administration of Holy Communion

Article I—On the Obligation of Giving Communion

335. We have already discussed (n. 249) the laws of the Church which determine the right to administer Holy Communion.

In addition to this right, some have a duty which springs from justice, others a duty which springs from charity.

A duty of justice. All pastors, and those who have charge of souls, are bound in justice to give the Holy Eucharist to their well disposed subjects, not only when these latter are obliged to receive Communion, but also when they wish to do so thru devotion, provided that their demand is reasonable.

This is a consequence of the quasi-contract existing between the pastor and his flock, which obliges him to furnish them with the means for practicing their religion.

It would therefore be a mortal sin for a pastor to refuse Communion without reason even on one occasion to anyone who asks for it thru devotion, or even to behave in such a manner that, because of his neglect or his ill temper, the faithful are prevented from complying with the desires of the Church concerning frequent Communion.[382]

We have spoken elsewhere of the duties of the pastor in all that pertains to Viaticum (n. 288) and the Communion of children (n. 317).

A duty of charity.—The priest who has not charge of souls, and the pastor when dealing with those who do not belong to his parish, are bound under pain of mortal sin to give Communion to the faithful only when it is a case of necessity, v.g., when they are at the point of death. Every priest should then see that the

382. It would be only a venial sin to refuse it occasionally; it would not be any sin at all if it were a question of importunate demands, or if the pastor were, at the moment, too busy.

The pastor would commit a real abuse of power by ordering his assistants to take Communion to the sick only a certain number of times a month or a week. This ruling would be directly in opposition to the doctrine of the Church; if the *frequent and public* carrying of the Holy Eucharist presents difficulties, it would be better to carry it privately, rather than deprive the unfortunate of the graces of Holy Communion.

dying person is furnished with the all-necessary aids contained in the Holy Eucharist; but as it is a question here of only an obligation of charity, any relatively serious inconvenience will dispense him from so doing.

During the Easter time, in a church that is without a pastor, or on a day when the concourse of the faithful is very great, if the priests in charge cannot meet the demands of the faithful, it is again a duty of charity for any priest at hand to render assistance, in order to satisfy the piety of the faithful and to forestall complaints.

Article II.—The Place and the Time for Communion

336. THE PLACE FOR COMMUNION.—It is allowed to distribute Communion wherever the celebration of Mass is authorized. Unlike the former legislation, there is now no longer any need of securing an indult to give Communion in private oratories; however, in *individual cases,*[383] and for a just reason, the Ordinary may forbid it.

In cases where the Ordinary permits the celebration of Mass outside a church or oratory, the celebrant may, at that Mass, also give Holy Communion.[384]

NOTE.—When a priest brings Communion to a sick person, he is not allowed to give Communion at the same time to the well persons of the household. The respect due to the Blessed Sacrament and the liturgical prescriptions demand that Christians who are in good health shall receive Communion in the church.

However, we believe that certain special circumstances may justify an exception to this rule; *with the permission of the Ordinary,* and on condition that all danger of scandal be avoided, we think that it would not be forbidden to give Communion to a pious person who is in the habit of receiving Communion frequently and whom the care of the sick person prevents from going to the church. However, such cases are very rare.

383. The Ordinary may not, therefore, issue this prohibition in a general manner, for instance in the *diocesan statutes,* even when restricting the prohibition to Easter Sunday.

384. In case of *local* interdict, those who are not responsible for the interdict and who are not under any censure, may receive Communion, unless expressly forbidden by the Superior who issued the interdict.

Even when a parish church is laid under interdict, the distribution of Holy Communion is not forbidden, unless a special clause to that effect is included in the interdict.

337. DAYS ON WHICH IT IS ALLOWED TO RECEIVE COMMUNION.—Communion, being the complement of the Mass, can be given every time that the celebration of Mass is allowed,[385] that is, in the Roman liturgy, every day except Good Friday (c. 867, Nos. 1 and 2). And even on Good Friday it is permitted to bring to the sick the *obligatory Viaticum;* not, however, a simple Communion of devotion. No pretext whatsoever can justify a violation of this rule.

There are also certain restrictions to be observed relating to Communion on Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday. *On Holy Thursday, when the solemn office is ended,* and the altar has been stripped, and the ciborium removed to another place, it is no longer allowed to give Holy Communion[386] except to the sick who are in danger of death; and it is out of consideration for them, and for them alone, that the rubrics of the Missal direct that some consecrated hosts shall be preserved. On the other hand, it is not forbidden, for a reasonable motive, to give Communion before the Mass.

On Holy Saturday, the faithful may receive Communion, but only at the Communion of the Mass, or immediately after the end of the ceremony[387] (c. 867, No. 3).

338. THE TIME OF COMMUNION.—The normal time during which it is permitted to give the Holy Eucharist corresponds to the normal time for the celebration of Mass (c. 867, No. 4), that is, from one hour before the *aurora* until one hour after midday (c. 821). It is preferable and more in keeping with the nature of the sacrifice to distribute the Holy Eucharist after the Communion of the priest (it would be an abuse, states the Holy See, to give Communion immediately after the consecration); but

385. The Ordinary cannot either interdict the distribution of Communion on days when it is permitted, nor authorize it on days when it is forbidden by the common law.

386. This prescription, moreover, binds only *sub levi*; but if the rubrics are observed, the distribution of Holy Communion after the office is impossible. In churches where the solemn office is not held, the prohibition against distributing Holy Communion does not exist; however, it is more in conformity with the mind of the Church to abstain from doing so. To recall more vividly the memory of the Last Supper, the Church wishes that on this day there shall be but one consecration and only one Eucharistic banquet.

387. This Canon has put an end to the controversy of theologians concerning the liceity of Communion on Holy Saturday. However, we must not forget that Communion (unless for a truly grave cause) is permitted only in churches where the ceremonies of the day are carried out, and on condition that it is morally united to those ceremonies, that is, that it is given by the priest, preferably at the time of Communion, or at the utmost, five or six minutes after the end of Mass.

The reason for this restriction is that regularly Holy Saturday is an *aliturgical* day, a day without any Mass; the office which is celebrated is only the anticipation of the office celebrated in days gone by during the night of the Resurrection.

the *Codex* does not require any special reason for giving Communion, either before, or after,[388] or outside the time of Mass.

Any reasonable cause, even tho slight, is enough to justify giving Communion outside the prescribed time. This cause may come from the part of the priest or from the part of the communicant; physical or moral impossibility, a contemplated journey, greater convenience, etc.; the farther removed the Communion is from the normal time, the more important should be the excuse, v.g., if it is a question of giving Communion in the evening or during the course of the night. Nevertheless, it would doubtless be only a venial sin to give Communion, even without any reason, outside the prescribed time.

On Christmas night, in chapels where the law permits the celebration of the three ritual Masses, it is likewise allowed to give Communion to those present (c. 821, No. 3). In parochial and conventual churches, where, on this day and at this hour, it is allowed to say *only one Mass* (except by a special indult) (c. 821, No. 2), it would seem that the same right must be accorded the faithful, since according to Canon 867, No. 4, Communion is allowed at whatever hour the celebration of Mass is permitted. However, a response from the President of the Commission of the *Codex* (Monit. Eccl., 1922, p. 371), seems to limit this privilege to cases where, in the opinion of the Ordinary, a reasonable cause (custom, pious desires, and the profit of the faithful) justifies the distribution of the Holy Eucharist.

Communion as Viaticum may be given at any hour of the day or night (c. 867, No. 5). The *Codex* makes no restrictions, and demands no special reasons.

Article III.—On the Distribution of Holy Communion

No. 1.—General Rules

339. The *Codex* reminds us of the obligation of carefully observing the rites and ceremonies prescribed in the rituals approved by the Church (c. 733, No. 1). The following are the chief rules:

1. In the Latin Church, Holy Communion must never be given to a lay person, under the form of wine, not even as Viaticum.

388. Without a grave reason it is not allowed for the celebrant to give Communion immediately before or immediately after the High solemn Mass, the *Missa cantata*, or the low conventual Mass (S. R. C., Jan. 19, 1906), it was also the custom in Rome not to give Communion *during* a chanted *Requiem* Mass; but this exception no longer holds.

(c. 852). The reasons which actuated the Church in prescribing Communion under the species of bread alone were very grave; and it would be a mortal sin to violate this law.[389]

2. *Priests* are bound to give Holy Communion according to the rite to which they belong, the Occidentals with unleavened bread, the Orientals with fermented bread. However, in case of necessity and in the absence of a priest of the other rite, a Latin priest may give Communion with fermented bread, and an Oriental priest may give Communion with unleavened bread; but even then each priest would follow the ceremonies of his own liturgy (c. 851).

For the faithful, on the contrary, there is no longer any obligation to receive Communion according to their own rite. Thru a simple motive of devotion, v.g., because Communion in a different rite is more convenient, they may receive the Holy Eucharist according to any Catholic rite (c. 866, No. 1). However, if it is a question of the Easter Communion, the *Codex advises*[390] the receiving of Communion according to the rite to which the communicant belongs (c. 866, No. 2); and it makes this obligatory when it is a question of Viaticum, except, of course, in case of necessity (c. 866, No. 3).

3. It is forbidden *(sub levi)* to give Communion with a large Host, or to give several small Hosts at the same time without a reasonable motive (v.g., in order to consume the hosts left in a ciborium; and even for this purpose it is not to be recommended). If the hosts are running short, it is not forbidden to divide those which remain in *two or three pieces,* or to detach some fragments from the priest's large Host.

4. Except in case of necessity, it is forbidden *(sub gravi)* to give Communion without any sacred vestments.[391] It would be

389. However, if there were no danger of irreverence, and it were impossible to have a consecrated host (an almost impossible supposition, since it is not allowed to consecrate one matter without the other), it would, perhaps, not be going against the mind of the Church to give Viaticum under the species of wine. (cf. Cappello, n. 451).

390. However, a reply from the Congregation for the Affairs of the Oriental Church (Oct. 31, 1922) declares that this paragraph does not apply to the Orientals, at least in the limits of their duly constituted patriarchates. For them, according to the Constitution *Tradita ab antiquis* of Pius X, there is always the strict obligation of receiving *the Easter Communion* in their own rite and from the hand of their own pastor. (cf. l'Ami du Clergé, 24, 565).

391. Outside the Mass, the stole is white or of the color of the day, but never black. The same holds good for the burse. A corporal must always be used; a pall will not suffice.
It is forbidden to distribute Holy Communion with only the alb and the crossed stole.

only a venial sin to dispense with surplice or stole, to omit lighting the candles, to omit certain of the prayers prescribed before or after the distribution of Communion.

To receive Communion, clerics should wear the surplice; deacons and priests add to these the stole, white, or of the same color as the vestments of the celebrant.

5. The priest, when giving Communion, should take the host with the thumb and index finger of the right hand; however, since the whole hand is consecrated, any reasonable motive justifies the use of the other fingers.

When there is a grave reason (v.g., in time of pestilence) the Church also permits the giving of the host with a small spoon; in like manner, when a sick person has difficulty in swallowing the host, it may be given to him (at least occasionally) with a little water or wine.[392].

6. The priest should (*sub levi*) be assisted by a server; a woman may not act in this capacity, except, where the custom exists, in a religious community, or in a sickchamber, and then only as regards the recitation of the prayers.

7. It is not allowed to give Communion, either during Mass, or outside of Mass, at an altar on which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed. This is an absolute rule; the Sacred Congregation of Rites sometimes permits the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice at the altar of exposition, but the distribution of Holy Communion remains prohibited, unless there is no other altar in the church.

During the exposition, the Blessed Sacrament must, therefore, be kept at another altar. In case there is only one altar in the church, a veil must be placed before the Blessed Sacrament during the distribution of Communion.[393]

No. 2. The Rite of Communion

The rite of Communion during the Mass is found in the Missal (X, 6) and in the Ritual (t. IV, c. 2, n. 10); the rite for Com-

392. In the church, for the Communion of the faithful, a fixed or removable linen cloth is placed on the Communion table, so that the communicants may hold it under their chin; but it is not allowed to use the veil of the chalice for that purpose, or the fingertowel, or the burse, or the purificator, or, with still more reason, the edge of the surplice, or the end of the celebrant's stole or maniple.

When it is a Bishop who is giving Communion his hand or his ring is kissed first; however, this rite is really commanded only at the solemn Mass.

393. In default of any other priest, it is tolerated if the celebrant, wearing the sacred vestments, gives Communion at another altar than that on which he is about to say Mass, or on which he has just said Mass.

munion outside of Mass, or immediately before or after Mass, is found in the Ritual (t. IV, c. 2, n. 1-9) (cf. Haegy, Manuel de Liturgie, I, p. 283).

340. DURING THE MASS, Communion is given after the Communion of the priest.[394]

The server recites the *Confiteor* (always in Latin); the celebrant opens the tabernacle;
makes a genuflection;
takes out and uncovers the ciborium;
makes another genuflection;
turns towards the faithful;
says the *Misereatur,* then the *Indulgentiam* (always in in the plural even if there is only one person to receive Communion);
blesses the communicants with his right hand.

He then makes another genuflection;
takes the ciborium in his left hand;
takes with his right hand a host which he holds a trifle over the ciborium;
turns towards the faithful;
says (always in Latin) *Ecce Agnus Dei;*
then *Domine non sum dignus* (3 times);
goes down the steps of the altar;
beginning on the epistle side, distributes Holy Communion,[395] making each time a sign of the cross with the host over the ciborium, and saying to *each* communicant: *Corpus Domini* etc.[396]

---

394. This is the most suitable time, and as it is most desirable to intimately unite the Communion with the Sacrifice, this rule must not be departed from thru simple caprice and without sufficient reason.

As a general rule, a priest should not distribute Communion at an altar while another priest is saying Mass thereon. To do this a serious reason would be required; according to certain theologians, *during the Canon,* it is permitted to distract the celebrant only for the purpose of taking Viaticum to the dying. *Outside the Canon,* a reasonable motive is sufficient (v. g., a large number of people for Communion). In this latter case, the priest who gives Communion waits till the priest finishes the prayer or the act that he has commenced: the celebrant does not open or close the tabernacle, but withdraws a little to the Epistle side, and kneels and bows his head *During the Canon,* he withdraws a little to the Gospel side, but without kneeling and without discontinuing the prayers.

395. The Mass-server, *if there is no cleric to receive Communion,* must be given Communion first; and even if he is wearing lay clothes, he is allowed to receive Communion on the altarsteps.

396. At the Communion of the newly-ordained (even for tonsure), the Bishop says: *Corpus D.N.J.C. custodiat te in vitam aeternam.* And each *ordinatus* answers *Amen.* But in giving Communion to newly-ordained priests, the Bishop omits *Agnus Dei* and *Domine non sum dignus.*

When the distribution of Communion is over, he:
returns to the altar without saying anything;
puts the ciborium on the altar;
makes a genuflection;
covers the ciborium;
puts it back in the tabernacle;
makes a genuflection;
locks the tabernacle; and
continues the Mass.

341. OUTSIDE OF MASS, the priest, in the sacristy, washes his hands; he then puts on the surplice and stole, which is white, or better, of the color of the day; he then goes to the altar, carrying the burse (of the same color as the stole) which contains the corporal. During this time, the server has lighted two candles; it is likewise the server who recites the *Confiteor.*

The ceremonies are the same as during the Mass, but they are completed in the following manner:

When he comes back to the altar, the priest makes a genuflection;
covers the ciborium;
washes and wipes his fingers;[397]
then he recites the antiphon *O sacrum convivium,*[398] with the versicles *Panem de coelo...Domine exaudi...Dominus vobiscum,* and the oration *Deus qui nobis.*
It is only *after he has completed these various ceremonies* that he puts the ciborium back in the tabernacle,
makes a genuflection;
locks the tabernacle; and
gives the blessing. In giving the blessing, he lifts his eyes;
extends his hands;
joins them together, inclining his head to the crucifix;
and begins the formula of benediction, *Benedictio Dei omnipotentis;*

397. For this purpose, there should be, quite close to the tabernacle, a small vessel of water and a purificator. This vessel should have a cover. It is preferable not to have a sponge in it. The water should be renewed frequently, and thrown into the *piscina.*

398. During the Easter time and during the octave of the Blessed Sacrament, *Alleluia* is added to the antiphon and to the versicle *Panem de coelo* and its responsorium. Moreover during the Easter time, the prayer *Deus qui nobis* is replaced by the Postcommunion of Easter Sunday, *Spiritum nobis, Domine, tuae caritatis infunde; ut quos sacramentis paschalibus satiasti, tua facias pietate concordes. Per Dominum. . . qui tecum vivit....*
These prayers are now *of obligation.*

continues it while turning toward the faithful; blesses them with one sign of the cross[399] (three, if he is a bishop).

NOTE. - - - In giving Holy Communion, it may happen that a consecrated Host may fall to the ground, or upon some object outside the corporal. In such a case, it must be taken up with all respect; and, if there is no reason to fear the wonderment of the people, the spot where it fell should be washed, and the water thrown into the *piscina*.

This ablution would not be required *sub gravi* unless there were serious reasons for fearing profanation of the sacred species; it is to be omitted if the Host falls on the face or the clothing of a person. Modesty might sometime demand that the person herself take up the Host and communicate herself, or give it back to the priest; after which, if convenient, she should wash her hands in the sacristy; the water is then to be thrown into the *piscina*.

No. 3. The Rite for the Communion of the Sick

342. CARRYING THE BLESSED SACRAMENT PUBLICLY AND PRIVATELY.—As a general rule, the Church wishes that the Blessed Sacrament shall be carried to the sick publicly,[400] and according to the rules of the Ritual, that is, with surplice, stole, and humeral veil (white), with lighted candles, and if possible, with a canopy or *ombrellino*.[401] In this case, it is the pastor alone, or a priest authorized by the pastor, who is allowed to carry the Blessed Sacrament.

But a just and reasonable cause permits the suppressing of all solemnity; for instance, if there is danger of irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament,[402] if there is reason to fear annoying the relatives of the sick person, or even if it is desired to make Communion

399. This blessing is not given before or after a Requiem Mass.
If the Communion were given by a deacon, he should follow the order of ceremonies given above, but without giving the final blessing (cf. n. 345, note).

400. If the sickchamber is near the chapel, so that the priest, when going to the sick man, does not lose sight of the altar, or so that his voice can be heard in the chapel, he may give the sick man Communion, even as Viaticum, during the Mass, just as with the rest of the congregation.

401. Men or youths, preferably members of the Confraternities of the Blessed Sacrament, should be the ones to carry the canopy, the bell, and the torches. The women may carry lights, *but they must follow the priest.* An exception, however, is to be made for communities of women where men are not allowed to enter.

402. It is better, unless there is a grave reason for the contrary, not to carry the Blessed Sacrament publicly during the night, when the distance is rather long and along the public roads.

and especially frequent Communion easy for the sick person, it is allowed to bring Holy Communion to him privately. In this case, any priest may bring it (cf. n. 252), with the authorization at least presumed of the priest who has charge of the Blessed Sacrament (c. 849, No. 1). In this case the priest must at least wear a stole over his ordinary clothing; he puts the pyx in a little sack or burse of white silk suspended from his neck, and he wears a cloak or other garment which is easy to put off. He should be accompanied by at least a layman, if a cleric cannot be had.[403]

343. While en route, the priest must be reserved and dignified;[404] he must not run, *except in case of necessity.* If he is old, or feeble, or if the distance is too great, he may use a horse, a carriage, or even a railway train, provided that all danger of irreverence is avoided. In order to prevent all scandal it is better, in such cases, to carry the Blessed Sacrament privately.

On the way, the priest recites the *Miserere* and, if the distance is great, other psalms, preferably the Penitential Psalms, or such canticles as the *Magnificat,* the *Benedictus,* etc.

344. When he enters the sickchamber, the priest says: *Pax huic domui,* and places the Blessed Sacrament on the table;[405] he makes a prostration on both knees, sprinkles the sick person and the room with holy water, reciting the antiphon *Asperges me*[406] with the versicles and orations.

Then the server says the *Confiteor;* the priest answers *Misereatur* and *Indulgentiam,* putting the formulas in the singular (unless there are several communicants in the same room); he gives Communion with the customary formula.[407] He then places the

---

403. It is always the priest who is to carry the Blessed Sacrament; to entrust the ciborium to a layman, even when it is enclosed in a burse, would demand a case of extreme necessity.

The surplice is not of obligation, and it would be extremely difficult to wear it under the coat or cloak; however, the priest should put on the surplice when he reaches the house of the sick person, before giving Communion.

404. In carrying the Blessed Sacrament privately, the priest may wear his hat; in carrying it publicly, he ordinarily goes bareheaded; but in case of rain or extreme cold, he may wear a cap of wool or some other headcovering.

405. This table, prepared beforehand, should be covered with a linen cloth, should have a crucifix between two lighted candles, a little vessel containing holy water, another small vessel with common water, and a small napkin, a little twig for an aspersorium, and a small Communion cloth.

406. Even during the Easter time, the *Asperges me* is said; and the *Alleluia* is not added. It is evident that if the sick man is in imminent danger of death, all the preparatory prayers and ceremonies are omitted.

407. To give Communion as Viaticum, the priest says: *Accipe, frater* (or *soror*), *Viaticum Corporis D.N.J.C., qui te custodiat ab hoste maligno et perducat te in vitam aeternam. Amen.*

Blessed Sacrament on the table, makes a genuflection, covers the ciborium, and washes his fingers. Finally, he recites the oration *Domine sancte,* and, before retiring, blesses the sick man with the ciborium, without saying anything.[408]

If there are several sick persons in the same room, the priest approaches the various beds and gives Communion. But if these sick persons are in different houses, or in rooms which are distinctly separate from one another, all the prescriptions of the Ritual must be followed in each case. In order that the priest may be dispensed from the necessity of beginning over again in each case, the various communicants must be in communication with the priest during the distribution of Communion, that is, they must be able to see him, or hear him reciting the prayers.

345. On his way back, if there are still some hosts left in the ciborium, the priest recites the psalm *Laudate Dominum de coelis,* and, if the way is long, other psalms, the *Te Deum,* the *Pange Lingua,* and hymns to the Blessed Sacrament.

When he reaches the church, he places the ciborium on a corporal in the middle of the altar, makes a genuflection, goes down to the bottom of the altarsteps, and there, on his knees, says the versicle *Panem de coelo* (with the *Alleluia* if it is during the Paschal time or within the octave of Corpus Christi); then, standing, he says *Dominus vobiscum* and (even during the Paschal time) the oration *Deus qui nobis* with the short conclusion. Then, going up to the altar, and turning half way round toward those present, he reminds them of the indulgences granted to persons who accompany the Blessed Sacrament; then, after another genuflection, he covers the ciborium with the humeral veil and gives the blessing,[409] even when there is *no one in the church except the server.*

---

408. If there is no consecrated host left, the priest gives the ordinary blessing with the formula *Benedictio Dei omnipotentis*..... The ablution is regularly to be given to the sick person; it may also be thrown into the fire or into the *piscina.*

If the sick man has difficulty in swallowing the host, it may be given to him in a spoon with a little water or even wine, or immediately after a mouthful of water.

If a priest brings Communion to a sick person, *may he give Communion to the well people who live in the same house?* (cf. n. 336, note).

409. When it is a deacon who brings Communion to the sick, he performs all the ceremonies of the Ritual, even the blessing given on the return to the Church with the ciborium. But he must not give the ordinary blessing with the hand or with the ostensorium.

CHAPTER VI

Concerning the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament

346. We need not undertake to prove the lawfulness of this practice; the Council of Trent visited an anathema upon those who said that it was not allowed to reserve the Holy Eucharist in the tabernacle, and that it must be distributed to the congregation immediately after the consecration (Sess. III, c. 7). The practice of reserving the Holy Eucharist has for its purpose the bestowal of the presence of Our Lord upon the faithful, the making it possible for them to enjoy His friendship and to offer Him their adoration, the furnishing them with the means of receiving Him even outside of the Mass and in the hour of death, the fostering of their piety by means of visits to the Blessed Sacrament, solemn expositions, processions, etc.

There are, however, certain differences on this point between the ancient and the modern discipline. In the early ages, especially in times of persecution, the Christians often received permission to keep the Holy Eucharist in their homes; they even took It with them on their journeys. To do this in these days, one must have a very special permission from the Holy See. According to the *Codex*, no one has the right to keep the Blessed Eucharist in his home, or to carry It with him when travelling[410] (c. 1265, No. 3). It would be a mortal sin to disregard this prohibition. Indeed, if anyone were to reserve the sacred species *with a bad intention,* he would be suspected of heresy and would incur an excommunication reserved *specialissimo modo* to the Holy See (c. 2320).

Article I.—The Obligation and the Permission to Reserve the Blessed Sacrament

347. There are *two conditions* required for the right to reserve the Holy Eucharist in a church; it is required that Mass be regularly celebrated in that church, at least once a week, and that there be someone[411] who has charge of the church (c. 1265, No. 1). This twofold prescription binds under pain of mortal sin; but the

410. This prescription applies even to missionaries. It was often disregarded during the late war in order to furnish the combatants with the spiritual aids which they needed.

411. As a general rule, this guardian should be the priest who celebrates the Mass; and he should live close to the church. For special reasons this care of the church may be entrusted to a layman (S.R.C., Decr. Authent., n. 3527).

occasional omission of Holy Mass, especially if there is a legitimate reason, would not be a mortal sin.

This general principle being established, the *Codex* makes a distinction between the churches in which the reservation of the Holy Eucharist is obligatory, and those in which it may be authorized by the bishop.

348. THE RESERVATION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST IS OBLIGATORY:

1. *In the cathedral church,* that is, in the church where the *see* of the Bishop is located, even tho it may not be a strictly parochial church.

The same holds good for the second cathedral church, when the Bishop governs two dioceses united under his jurisdiction.

2. *In the principal church of an Abbacy or Prelature nullius,* that is, exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. This church is the one where the Abbot or the Prelate have their see, and which constitutes, in a way, their cathedral.

3. *In the principal church of a Vicariate- or Prefecture-Apostolic,* in countries where the Catholic hierarchy is not yet established.

4. *In all parochial churches,* no matter to what class the parishes belong, removable or irremovable, with or without distinction of race or language, for all the faithful or for a particular category of families or persons; and even, no doubt, if they possessed the parochial character for only a time.[412]

5. *In quasi-parochial churches,* that is, in the churches of Vicariates- and Prefectures-Apostolic, which have a special rector.

6. *In the churches of exempt religious houses,* whether of men or of women. It is not required that these religious have solemn vows; and the obligation binds both the "clerical" and the "lay" communities, both houses that are "formed," (that is, composed of at least six religious, of whom four must be priests when it is a question of a "clerical" community) and houses not formed. Their exemption makes of their house a sort of parish composed of all the members of the religious family.[413]

412. Theologians accord to filial churches (chapels of ease) the right to keep the Blessed Sacrament. The Holy See permits the Ordinary to give them this authorization, *attenta immemorabili consuetudine* (A.S.S., 1924, p. 115). But in this case, it is a permission, not an obligation.

413. The only condition required is that the house be canonically erected.

This privilege and obligation do not apply to oratories, of whatsoever nature they may be, which belong to religious but are independent of their house; to keep the Blessed Sacrament there, there must be an indult from the Holy See.

349. This obligation of reserving the Blessed Sacrament is grave for all the churches enumerated above; but it applies in a particular manner to parish churches. Neither custom nor the proximity of another church can dispense from this obligation.

Nevertheless, when several parishes are very close together and are too poor to keep things going, it is not forbidden for the Bishop to designate one of them for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament; and it is to this church that the various pastors, who are bound to share the expenses, must come to get the Holy Eucharist; (Congr. of the Council, August 12, 1604).

In case the church is too dilapidated, or is in course of reconstruction, or is shared by Catholics and heretics, the Blessed Sacrament is to be reserved in a separate chapel or other fitting place (v.g., in a room in the pastor's house). (Congr. of the Propaganda, Aug. 3, 1803).

350. Under the conditions enumerated above (n. 347), the ORDINARY OF THE PLACE, (Bishop, Vicar-General, Vicar Capitular, etc.) CAN AUTHORIZE[414] THE RESERVATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT:

1. *In collegiate churches* which are not parochial, that is, in churches which, with the consent of the Holy See, have a Chapter of Canons.

2. *In the principal oratory,* public or semi-public,[415] of a *pious house,* that is, of a house whose purpose is the promotion of divine worship or the exercise of charity toward the neighbor (hospitals, orphanages), even if the direction of this house is not ecclesiastical or religious, provided that a priest exercises his ministry in it.

3. *In the principal oratory of every religious house,* that is, of every house where several persons, after taking *public* vows of religion, live together in obedience to a rule approved by the Church.

4. *In the principal oratory of every ecclesiastical college,* that is, of every college which is conducted by priests or monks, and

414. It would certainly be a mortal sin to keep the Blessed Sacrament for a long time without authorization and without reason; it would be only a venial sin to do this for only a few days; and a reasonable motive would eliminate all sin.

This authorization of the Ordinary is required even for regulars, unless by a special privilege. The *Codex* has not suppressed the privilege granted to the dispersed religious of France and Italy to have, in houses where there are at least four priests, an oratory, and to keep the Blessed Sacrament in it. (cf. Vermeersch, De Religiosis, II, n. 143).

415. Remark that the private oratories of Cardinals and Bishops have all the rights and privileges of semi-public oratories (c. 1189).

whose purpose is either to train priests or monks, or simply to give children a Christian education. This privilege can be granted to such houses even when they are maintained by the State or by private individuals.

5. When it is a question of a church or an oratory which does not belong to any of the above-mentioned categories, the Ordinary cannot authorize the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in a habitual manner. To obtain this favor for a lengthy period (v.g. for more than two weeks), recourse must be had to the Holy See.

However, when it is a question of a *church or public oratory,* and when there is a legitimate reason, the Ordinary may permit the reservation of the Holy Eucharist, even at various times, but only for an extraordinary occasion and for a short time, v.g., on the occasion of a pilgrimage, a triduum, or even of a novena (c. 1265).

The Ordinary does not possess this power when it is a question of a semi-public or private oratory, except, of course, when there is a grave reason and it is impossible to have recourse to the Holy See (v.g., in case of urgent repairs to the parish church).

351. SPECIAL PRESCRIPTIONS.—

1. All churches which reserve the Blessed Sacrament, and more particularly all parish churches, must be open to the faithful for some hours each day (c. 1266). This is a condition *sine qua non;* to reserve the Blessed Sacrament without observing it, it would be necessary to have an apostolic indult.

2. In a religious house or a pious house, the Blessed Sacrament can be kept only in the church or the principal oratory; and in monasteries, it cannot be kept in the choir or within the precincts of the cloister. All contrary privileges are revoked (c. 1267).

The reason for the second part of this prescription is plain from the fact that a priest has not the right to violate the enclosure in order to say Mass every week in a chapel which is reserved exclusively to the community.

As regards the first part, it has been interpreted as follows by the Commission of the *Codex* (June 2-3, 1918, A.A.S., vol. X, p. 346): when the religious or pious house possesses a public church, and makes use of it for its ordinary and daily exercises of piety, it is in this church, and there alone, that the Blessed Sacrament is to be kept. If the exercises habitually take place in another

oratory of the house, it is allowed to keep the Blessed Sacrament there; but this does not nullify the same right which the public church may enjoy on another count (v.g., as a chapel of an exempt religious community). However, in the same edifice, this privilege can be enjoyed by only one oratory; to keep the Blessed Sacrament in several oratories of the same house, it is required that the house "shelter distinct and separate families, that is, several distinct religious or pious houses."[416]

NOTE.—There is hardly any need to call attention to the fact that what is forbidden by the common law may be authorized by an indult. To secure permission to keep the Blessed Sacrament in a semi-public or private chapel, or in several oratories of the same house, recourse must be had, according to the nature of the case, either to the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, or to the Sacred Congregation of Religious, or to the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda.

Article II.—Prescriptions Relating to the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament

Under this title we shall group together the various prescriptions whose purpose is to insure for the Holy Eucharist the respect and honor that are due It.

No. 1. The Altar

352. The Holy Eucharist must always be kept at the altar, except in the case described below (n. 360); the Bishop himself cannot dispense from this rule, except for a very grave reason, and when it is impossible to have recourse to the Holy See.

Moreover, it is not allowed *habitually*[417] to reserve the Holy Eucharist at more than one altar in the same church (c. 1268, No. 1). However, in churches where they have the perpetual exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, it is allowed and even commanded

416. This is the case of a house in which several different communities reside, the case of a seminary in which a community of religious women has charge of the housekeeping.

But the Blessed Sacrament cannot be kept at the same time in the common oratory and in the infirmary, nor at the same time in the common oratory and in the oratory of the novitiate, unless the community and the novitiate occupy separate buildings.

417. This word shows very plainly that, for a special reason (v.g. a large number of communicants on feast days) the Blessed Sacrament may be kept at two altars, provided that this is not done constantly.

to keep the Holy Eucharist at an altar different from the altar of exposition; and it is there that Holy Communion must be given to the faithful (S.R.C., May 18, 1878).

Finally, the Blessed Sacrament must be kept in the most conspicuous and most important place in the Church, that is, generally speaking, at the high altar. It is allowed, however, to choose another altar, which, better located and more richly ornamented, favors devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and lends more splendor to it (c. 1268, No. 2). Moreover, on the occasion of a feast, a triduum, the exercises of the month of Mary or of the Sacred Heart, etc., it is not forbidden to transfer the Blessed Sacrament from the main altar to another ordinary altar.

353. The *Codex* sets forth the obligation of observing the liturgical prescriptions which are special to the last days of Holy Week. They are as follows:

On Holy Thursday, there must be prepared in a chapel of the church, a repository, which shall be adorned as richly as possible,[418] to receive the chalice containing the Host which, on the morrow, will serve for the Mass of the Presanctified.

The Host must not be exposed in such a fashion that it is visible to the faithful. The chalice is to be placed in a solid and richly ornamented tabernacle, provided with a door which can be locked with a key, and located in the middle of the altar, in the midst of six candlesticks.

NOTE.—It is not allowed to put in the same tabernacle the Hosts which are kept over after the Mass of Holy Thursday to serve for cases where Viaticum may have to be administered. They are to be kept until after the Mass of Holy Saturday, in a separate and closed chapel, or in some fitting place in the sacristy.[419] If, however, there is no other fitting place, the *Memoriale Rituum* permits the placing of the ciborium in the tabernacle of the repository, either until the Mass of the Presanctified, or even, when it is absolutely impossible to do otherwise, until the Mass on Holy Saturday. In this case, four candles are kept burning at the re-

418. This decoration should be, so far as possible, by means of flowers, lights, and white draperies; but all emblems of mourning must be eliminated, and all images or representations of the Passion, and all ostensoria, chalices, etc.

The principal purpose (and originally the only purpose) of this exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, is to commemorate the institution of the Holy Eucharist; but little by little, popular devotion began to see in it a representation of the burial of the Lord. Hence the name "Tomb" which is sometimes given to the Repository.

419. In churches where there is no fear of having to give Viaticum to the dying, it is also allowed to reserve the Holy Eucharist.

pository until the end of the Mass of the Presanctified; after that, it is enough to keep a lamp burning day and night before the Blessed Sacrament.

On Good Friday, it is forbidden to offer the Holy Eucharist to the adoration of the faithful; and even in the evening, it is not allowed to bring the Blessed Sacrament back to its habitual altar.

354. In cathedral, collegial, and conventual churches, in order not to interfere with the liturgical ceremonies which take place at the principal altar, *it is well* not to keep the Blessed Sacrament *habitually* at that altar, but rather in some other chapel (c. 1268, No. 3).

This is not a strict precept, but only a practical recommendation, which does not prevent the keeping of the Blessed Sacrament at the main altar, especially on certain feasts. However, on the days when the Bishop solemnly officiates at Mass or Vespers, the Blessed Sacrament must be transferred to another altar (Caerem. Episc., l. I, c. XII, n. 8).

355. No matter which the altar is at which the Blessed Sacrament is kept, the rector of the church must see that it is more richly adorned than all the others (c. 1268, No. 4). It is first of all a mark of respect for Our Lord who is present amongst us, and it is moreover, a means of stimulating the piety of the faithful.[420]

No. 2. The Tabernacle

356. The Holy Eucharist must be kept in an immovable tabernacle,[421] placed in the middle of the altar (c. 1269, No. 1). This is a grave law, and the Bishop cannot dispense from it.

Normally, there is only one fixed tabernacle in the church; when the Blessed Sacrament is exposed at the main altar, it is permitted to place a portable tabernacle on the altar where the Blessed Sacrament is to be kept.

This tabernacle must be carefully constructed, solidly closed on all sides,[422] and ornamented decently and in conformity with the

420. Is it necessary to point out the incongruity, or, if you will, the impropriety of covering with flowers and loading with lights the altar of a saint while the Blessed Sacrament is compelled to do with a humble lamp, so that at times strangers find it difficult to discover the altar where Our Lord is kept?

421. It does not seem that the *Codex* requires an absolutely immovable tabernacle; it is enough if it is hard to displace.
This Canon forbids tabernacles to be located on one side of the altar, or in the wall of the church, or in a tower situated close to the altar.

422. It is forbidden to fit the tabernacle with a glass door which allows the interior to be seen.

laws of liturgy; it must contain nothing but the sacred vessels which hold the Blessed Eucharist, or which have not yet been purified.[423] It must be guarded with all possible care, so as to prevent all danger of sacrilegious profanation (c. 1269, No. 2).

There is no one material particularly specified for the construction of tabernacles; wood, marble, the various metals, all may be used, provided they are susceptible of elegant ornamentation. In these days various ingenious methods have been devised to protect the Blessed Sacrament from burglars or fire; the Ordinary should, before authorizing them, make sure that they do not in any way offend against the liturgical laws.

357. The interior of the tabernacle should be suitably ornamented, that is, it should be entirely covered with white silk, or cloth of gold or cloth of silver, or even with gilded plates. Sometimes a curtain of white silk, embroidered or fringed with gold, is added; this is neither forbidden nor prescribed. The sacred vessels stand upon a corporal or at least on a pall.

Externally, the tabernacle must be covered with a *conopaeum,*[424] white, or better still, of the color of the day, but never black.[425] This *conopaeum* is not simply a cover to protect the tabernacle from dust; it must be a real ornament. Its place cannot be taken by images painted or sculptured on the door of the tabernacle and representing the Last Supper or certain pious emblems; and the *conopaeum is required even when the tabernacle is made of a precious material, such as gold or silver.* According to the responses of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, only one reason can dispense from this rule, and that is, the physical or moral impossibility of having or using this ornament.[426]

358. On the tabernacle, it is not allowed to put either statues,

423. It would be a more or less serious sin to keep other objects in the tabernacle, such as the holy oils, relics, purified ciboria, etc.

424. The *conopaeum* gives the tabernacle the appearance of a tent; it is the *most certain sign of the presence of the Blessed Sacrament*; and hence it must be taken away when the tabernacle is empty.
The *conopaeum* is ordinarily of silk decorated with fringes; but it may be of cotton, wool, etc, and decorated with embroidery or painting.
During Lent and Advent, the violet *conopaeum* is permitted only when the Mass of the season or a Requieum Mass is being said.

425. For an office of the dead the *conopaeum* will therefore be violet. However, white may always be used. It may be of cloth of gold, but yellow silk will not do, since yellow is not a liturgical color.

426. When the tabernacle is so constructed that it cannot be properly surrounded by a conopaeum, at least the door of it must be covered with a small veil; a very special construction may sometimes be sufficient reason to maintain a custom that is contrary to the liturgy. At St. Peter's in Rome, the tabernacle, an imitation of the *Tempietto* of Bramante, has no *conopaeum.*

or flowers, or relics (not even relics of the True Cross), nor any other object,[427] except the crucifix prescribed by the rubrics. Therefore, the *ciborium* or throne for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament must not be fastened to the tabernacle; it is to be placed there only when it is about to be used; and it must be taken away when the ceremony is finished (S.R.C., May 27, 1911).

It is allowed to put reliquaries, flowers, statuettes, on either side of the tabernacle, but never before the door of the tabernacle.

359. The tabernacle must certainly be blessed (S.R.C., June 20, 1899). This blessing (Ritual, t. VIII, c. 23) can be given by the pastor or the rector of the church (c. 1304).

360. Prudence may sometimes recommend the keeping of the Blessed Sacrament somewhere else than on the altar. To do this, a grave cause (v.g., fear of profanation or sacrilegious theft) is required, and the permission of the Ordinary must be secured. Moreover, this practice is allowed only *during the night,* with the obligation of placing the Holy Eucharist on a corporal, in a decent place which is safer than the altar (ordinarily in the sacristy and in a safe), and of keeping a lamp constantly burning before the Blessed Sacrament (c. 1269).

No. 3. The Key of the Tabernacle

361. The tabernacle where the Blessed Sacrament is kept must be locked with a key, and this key[428] must be guarded very carefully. This is a *grave obligation of conscience* for the priest who has charge of the church or oratory (c. 1269).

It is forbidden, consequently, to leave the key in the door of the tabernacle, or on the altar, or in a cabinet in the sacristy which is accessible to everybody.

On various occasions, the Sacred Congregation of Rites has declared that the priest who is in charge of the chapel or church must keep the key himself in his own house, or in the sacristy under another lock and key; this is the surest method and the one most in harmony with the prescriptions of the Holy See.[429] In practice,

427. It is likewise forbidden to put a statue of the Sacred Heart or of the Blessed Virgin on a pedestal or in a niche behind the tabernacle and above the altar, when the Blessed Sacrament is being kept there (S.R.C., March 31, 1887).

428. It is proper that this key should be of a precious material, or at least gilded or silver-plated, and attached to a little chain of similar material. It is wise to have two keys for the same tabernacle.

429. In a church which is at one and the same time a cathedral or collegial church and a parish church, the Chapter and the pastor have the right to each possess a key; in other parish churches, the pastor alone can claim that right.

certain difficulties have often suggested and brought about the adoption of other practices;[430] the *Codex* does not condemn them absolutely; it does not make it an explicit obligation for the priest to keep the key in his own possession, but it bids him take all the precautions necessary to see that the key is well protected.

No. 4. The Ciborium

362. Another grave precept is that the Holy Eucharist shall be kept in a ciborium (c. 1270). In order to guard against sacrilegious thefts, sometimes permission is requested of the Holy See to keep it in a simple corporal; but concessions of this kind are extremely rare.

The ciborium must be of a solid and suitable material; the most fitting material is gold or silver, but neither is obligatory. Tin, or copper, or bronze may be used; but even tho there is no formal precept in the matter, the respect due the Blessed Sacrament demands that the cup shall be goldplated on the inside and silverplated on the outside.[431]

Iron, lead, stone, ivory, wood, papier maché, glass, even aluminum (unless mixed with a large percentage of gold), are to be avoided as unseemly or lacking in solidity.

363. Evidently the ciborium must be clean; it is not allowed to put a linen cloth inside it, to serve as a corporal and separate the hosts from the cup. The ciborium must have a cover of metal, and not be merely covered with a pall or a corporal. Finally, on the outside, it must be covered with a veil (*pavillon*) of white silk, richly decorated if possible.

364. All authors admit that the ciborium is not to be consecrated; very probably it should be blessed, but even that is not of grave obligation. The formula to be used for this blessing is the same as for the blessing of tabernacle.

---

430. In the chapels of religious women and in private oratories which have no regular chaplain, it is usually one of the religious or a member of the indultarian's family who has charge of the key of the tabernacle; sometimes this is the only possible way.

431. The same remarks apply to the lunula and the ostensorium. The lunula must be so constructed that the consecrated host will rest on the two branches (or circles) of gold or of goldplated metal, and not on the glass plates which are quite often used to enclose it. It is allowed to use lunulae of glass only when there is a serious difficulty in securing other kinds.

No. 5. The Sanctuary Lamp

365. Before the tabernacle where the Blessed Sacrament is kept, there must be *at least one* lamp[432] burning; it must burn without interruption day and night (even when the candles on the altar are lighted during Mass or during exposition of the Blessed Sacrament). According to certain authors, it would be a mortal sin to allow, thru neglect, this lamp to remain unlighted for a whole day or for several nights.

366. In this lamp olive oil must be burned, or beeswax, or a mixture of these two substances. In default of olive oil, the Ordinary of the place can permit the use of other oils, of vegetable origin so far as is possible (v.g., linseed oil, colza oil, poppy oil, etc.) (c. 1271). The text does not forbid the use of mineral oils; but it is only in case of necessity that kerosene may be used; and the mere plea of economy cannot be regarded as sufficient.

The powers of the Ordinary in certain special circumstances are broader still. For on the 23d of February, 1916, a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites gave him the power "because of the scarcity of olive oil or its unduly high price, and *so long as this state of affairs persisted,* to authorize the use not only of vegetable oils, but also of beeswax mixed with other waxes, and even, in default of any other kind of light, of an electric bulb." It does not seem that this decree has been revoked; it is true that the circumstances which produced it have, generally speaking, disappeared with the war; but they may also have a different origin. In those dioceses where the Ordinary sees that it is extremely difficult to use olive oil, he may permit the use of another kind of light. In all cases he is the only one who is competent to weigh the circumstances and give a decision.

Let us add, however, that there is very rarely any occasion to permit the use of electric light; for it is tolerated only *when no vegetable or mineral oil* is to be had. It is because of the mystical meaning which it attached to it that the Church gives the preference to olive oil; and when olive oil is not to be had, then we are to use the material which most closely resembles it.[433]

---

432. According to the Ceremonial of Bishops several lamps (an odd number) are required before the Blessed Sacrament. This rule applies only to cathedral churches and to the feast days when the Bishop officiates, and it is not even then a formal precept.

433. The lamp is a figure of Our Lord who, like the oil, enlightens, nourishes, soothes, and strengthens souls; it also symbolizes the Christian people who are consumed in the presence of God.

367. This lamp must be placed before the tabernacle,[434] *in proximity to the altar.* It must be easily seen by the faithful, for one of its purposes is to indicate the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. It is usually suspended in the middle of the choir; that is the place that is best suited for it, and the place that is recommended by tradition. But it is not forbidden to put it on one side of the choir, on an iron arm attached to the wall (S. R. C., June 2, 1883). If a transparent glass is used, it should, to be more in conformity with the spirit of the liturgy, be colorless. However, the use of an opaque glass is permitted, green or red in color.

No. 6. The Renewal of the Sacred Species

368. To avoid all danger of corruption of the sacred species, the *Codex* ordains that all the consecrated hosts, reserved for the Communion of the faithful or for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, shall be frequently renewed and replaced by hosts that have been recently baked (c. 1272). As it is difficult to lay down rules on this point which are applicable to all countries, the Ordinary has the right to make the necessary regulations; and all priests (even exempt religious) are bound to carefully observe them.

1. These regulations treat first of all of the *renewal* of the Sacred Species.

As a general rule, all the Western[435] churches should renew the Sacred Species *once a week.* This is the rule laid down by the Ceremonial of Bishops, and it is likewise the constant discipline of the Church, at least since the days of St. Charles Borromeo. However, it would not be a sin to allow ten or even fifteen days to pass without doing this, if the hosts had been freshly baked and there was no danger of corruption,[436] and therefore of irreverence. This doctrine is in conformity with the practice of many churches, and has often been approved by the Holy See (Lehmkuhl, n. 178).

---

434. Its place, therefore, is not on the altar itself (and this custom has been condemned by the Holy See), nor above the altar, nor, with still greater reason, behind the altar.

435. In the Orient the discipline varies with the rites. Many synods forbid the keeping of the sacred species more than three days.

436. With the new methods of making hosts the danger of corruption is less than certain authors indicate. But since, in judging of this danger, we must take into consideration the circumstances of climate, manner of cooking, quality of flour, the *Codex* rightly reserves to the Ordinary the duty of making the needed regulations.

2. The hosts to be consecrated must be *recently baked*. Most authors, with St. Charles Borromeo, require that they be not more than twenty days old. Here again the circumstances of the place and the method of baking must be taken into consideration, but it is not probable that the special prescriptions permit the conservation of hosts that are more than a month old.

Quite recently, the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments formally condemned the practice of certain dioceses where hosts that were *two or three months old* were used for the Holy Sacrifice (A. A. S., XI, p. 8). And this prohibition applies to all dioceses and all churches, without distinction as to place, or climate, or time; nowhere, nor at any season of the year, can we regard as "*recent*," and therefore in conformity with the canonical and liturgical prescriptions, hosts that are two or three months old.

369. The *Codex* goes on to say that after the renewal of the Sacred Species, the old hosts must be consumed. They must not be mixed with the new ones;[437] if it is impossible to consume them at once, they are to be kept in a separate ciborium.

When it appears that the hosts are beginning to corrupt, they should be consumed at once. But this is not always possible. In such a case, they should be put in a ciborium or some other clean vessel, and kept in the tabernacle until they have become entirely corrupted. They are then to be burned, and the ashes thrown into the *piscina* together with the water used to purify the ciborium.

NOTE.—The Rubrics do not give any directions for the *purification of a ciborium*. Here are several methods.

The most simple method consists of using the thumb and the index finger of the right hand to carefully collect the particles contained in the ciborium and causing them to fall into the chalice, before taking the ablutions. This is the proper method to employ when new hosts are to be put immediately into the same ciborium, in this way they will not be affected by moisture.

The second method is longer but surer and more seemly, especially if the ciborium is not to be used again immediately. After having gathered into the chalice the particles contained in the ciborium, as described above, the priest pours wine into the ciborium, causes it to flow gently about the interior of the cup, pours it into the chalice, and consumes the particles together with the

437. Unless they are few in number, and can be placed so as to be distributed first that same day or on the morrow.

purification. He then washes his fingers with wine and water over the ciborium, wipes his fingers, pours the ablution into the chalice, takes the ablution, and wipes first the chalice and then the ciborium.

Others content themselves with pouring only the purification of wine into the ciborium; they make the last ablutions as usual, and finally wipe first the chalice and then the ciborium.

Article III.—The Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament

371. The Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament consists of presenting the Holy Eucharist to the adoration of the faithful.[438] It is *private* if it performed with the ciborium; *public,* if it is performed with the ostensorium.[439]

372. PRIVATE EXPOSITION is permitted for any reasonable motive and without the necessity of securing the permission of the Ordinary, in those churches and oratories which have the right to reserve the Blessed Sacrament (c. 1274). A motive of devotion is sufficient; however, a priest is not allowed to open the door of the tabernacle for no other reason than to satisfy his own personal devotion.

Private exposition consists simply in *opening the door of the tabernacle;* it is forbidden to expose the ciborium on the altar or on a throne.[440] The priest should wear the surplice and a white stole and (if he wishes) a cope: at least six candles are lighted; the incensing of the Blessed Sacrament is not prescribed; in Rome the incensing is omitted, at least when the priest does not wear the cope. The ceremony may close, and usually does close with benediction; but this is not obligatory. When benediction is given, the *Tantum Ergo* is to be recited or sung beforehand, with its versicle

438. The *Codex* bids all those who have charge of souls to neglect nothing that would be calculated to encourage the piety of the faithful towards the Holy Eucharist, and to recommend to them, even during the week, frequent assistance at Mass and frequent visits to the Blessed Sacrament (c. 1273).

Another means for promoting devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, is the erection of a confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, in conformity with the prescriptions of Canon 711, No. 1. This confraternity, divided into three sections, for men, women, and children, will be a potent source of religious life in the parish and the best possible support for other pious societies.

439. It is not, therefore, the motive, but the manner of exposition which makes the exposition public or private.

Public exposition is more or less solemn according to the splendor of the ceremonies and the number of the ministers.

440. Even when there is no ostensorium, it is not allowed to give this sort of exposition.

and oration; then the priest, wearing the humeral veil, takes the ciborium from the tabernacle, places it on a corporal which has been spread in the middle of the altar at the beginning of the ceremony, covers the ciborium with the ends of the humeral veil, and gives the benediction.

373. PUBLIC EXPOSITION, that is, benediction with the ostensorium, is regulated by stricter rules.

In public churches,[441] which have the right to reserve the Blessed Sacrament, this exposition is allowed by the common law on the feast of Corpus Christi and during its octave, at High Mass and Vespers.[442]

Outside this time, in order to be permitted to expose the Blessed Sacrament publicly, whether in churches or in public or semi-public oratories, there must be a just and even a grave cause, and the authorization of the Ordinary must be secured,[443] even in churches which belong to exempt religious[444] (c. 1274).

374. As a general rule, the explicit permission of the Ordinary must be secured. However, in an urgent case, it is allowed, if there is not time to have recourse to the Ordinary, to presume this permission.

375. This permission supposes a grave and just reason, preferably a reason of public interest, that is, which pertains to the whole community or to an important group of the faithful; v.g., prayers to avert natural catastrophes, the existence of war, the petition for rain, the asking of the cure of a spiritual or temporal leader; it is enough that this ceremony be a means of stimulating the piety of the faithful, of making their prayers more fervent and of helping them to rid themselves of profane distractions.

376. The priest or the deacon is the one who is allowed to ex-

441. This general authorization applies only to churches properly so called, open to *all the faithful* and not to merely a group or a community; it does not apply to oratories, even public oratories, which have the right to keep the Blessed Sacrament (A.A.S., 1922, p. 529).

442. To this general permission must be added that which Leo XIII granted on August 20, 1885 to all *parish* churches, and which the *Codex* has not revoked. According to this decree, these churches, during all the month of October are to add the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament to the recitation of the Rosary and the Litany. If these churches are too poor, the Ordinary can give them permission to have merely private exposition.

443. It would be, *in se,* a mortal sin to *often* expose the Blessed Sacrament without the permission of the Ordinary.

444. According to certain theologians, regulars, in order to have public exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in their churches or in their oratories, *closed to the public,* need only the permission of their Major Superior (Vermeersch-Creusen, II, 599). According to Lehmkuhl (n. 179), the exposition should be, in such a case, considered as private. This teaching does not correspond with the definition commonly adopted.

pose the Blessed Sacrament and put it back in the tabernacle. But the priest alone is allowed to give benediction with the Holy Eucharist.[445]

Whenever there has been an exposition of the Blessed Sacrament at a service, benediction must be given before locking it up in the tabernacle, and it is never allowed to omit this benediction (S. R. C., July 12, 1889).

377. The *Codex* commands the holding each year in all churches where the Blessed Sacrament is habitually reserved, and with all possible solemnity, of the EXPOSITION OF THE FORTY HOURS, the details of which are regulated by the Instruction of Clement XI (Jan. 21, 1705), modified in certain particulars by a decree of the Holy Office (Jan. 22, 1914). The rector of the church is the one who is to select the days for this solemnity and have his selection approved by the Ordinary.[446]

If special circumstances make it too difficult to hold this ceremony *uninterrupted* during nearly two whole days, or make it impossible to assure Our Lord the homage that is His due, the Ordinary will prescribe, on certain days, an exposition which is more solemn than usual and which is prolonged for at least several hours (c. 1275).

This is what is done ordinarily in France, where, in most of the dioceses, the Exposition of the Forty Hours is replaced by a species of *perpetual adoration,* that is, an adoration which is held during a whole day or several hours of a day by each of the parishes in succession.

378. Except for the Exposition of the Forty Hours, which must be held at the main altar, the Blessed Sacrament may be exposed at any altar. It is placed on a throne[447] (or exposition), made of wood, or of gilded metal, or covered with white silk, and surmounted with a dais or baldachino. There must be on the altar neither relics, nor statues, with the exception of the statues of adoring angels or of angels which hold the candelabra.

---

445. The deacon has this authorization only if he is called to carry Viaticum to a sick person; on his return, he should bless those present with the ciborium.

446. To atone for the offenses offered the divine majesty on the occasion of the excesses of the carnival, Benedict XIV (January 1, 1748) recommended the pious practice of an exposition *ad instar* to that of the Forty Hours which ordinarily is held on the first three days of the week of Quinquagesima. It does not continue during the night, and it has fewer privileges and indulgences attached to it than the exposition of the Forty Hours.

447. For a ceremony of short duration, the Blessed Sacrament may be simply placed on the altar, in front of the tabernacle.

379. When the public exposition of the Blessed Sacrament is being held, the altar must be continually illuminated by at least twelve[448] candles, even in poor churches; and the Ordinary may prescribe a larger number. At least twenty are required for the very solemn expositions, such as that of the Forty Hours.

The candlesticks in which the burning candles are placed, may stand on the very table of the altar, towards the back, or on the gradines. Candles may also be placed in brackets attached to the anterior corners of the altar, or on the sides of the throne of exposition.

Besides the lights specified for the altar, there should be, regularly, at least two candles or torches of wax held by clerics in surplices. In default of clerics, two candles are to be lighted in the great candelabra which are on the floor at each side of the altar.

Finally, it is entirely lawful to adorn the altar with flowers (natural or artificial); their regular place is between the candlesticks, to the right and the left of the tabernacle. On the other hand it is *entirely contrary to the spirit of the liturgy and to good taste* to encumber the altar with candelabra filled with stearine candles, or with *pots* of flowers. The veneration of the Blessed Sacrament should always maintain a grave and sacred character; and it is violating the sacred traditions of the liturgy to transform the altar into a garden of flowers, or to give the sanctuary the appearance of a fashionable salon.

380. When the Benediction immediately follows a service, the color of that service is used, with the exception of the humeral veil, which is *always white.* If it is given as a separate ceremony, the vestments are always white, as well as the *conopaeum* and the *antependium.*

It is never allowed to give benediction with the ostensorium without wearing stole, cope, and humeral veil.

381. Except for the Forty Hours, there are no chants prescribed for the *exposition* of the Blessed Sacrament; but it is proper

448. Let us state once more that electric light is never permitted on the altar. The decrees of the Congregation of Rites *forbid its use:*

1:—in the place of the wax candles prescribed by the rules of the liturgy;

2:—even in addition to these candles, for the purpose of increasing the illumination, either on the gradines or on the table of the altar;

3:—around the tabernacle of the Blessed Sacrament;

4:—on the exterior or in the interior of the *ciborium* or place of exposition.

Abuses abound on these various points, but they remain abuses. Let us also remark that it would be most unseemly to attach to the tabernacle one or more electric lamps for the purpose of giving light to the celebrant at the altar.

to sing a motet, a hymn, or an antiphon of the office of the Blessed Sacrament.[449] The incensing is required after the exposition.

One may then recite or sing prayers in the vulgar tongue (the beads, canticles,[450] the act of atonement, litanies, etc.); but these prayers are not permitted from the commencement of the liturgical function of the benediction of the Blessed Sacrament (that is, as soon as the priest and the sacred ministers who are to officiate at the reposition, are at the altar)[451] until the blessing is given by the celebrant. The *Tantum Ergo* is obligatory before the benediction. There is a second incensing at the *Genitori;* then

449. The abuses of which we have just spoken in the decoration of the altar, are also frequent in the chants rendered during the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. It is very strange that the prescriptions of Pius X on this subject (*Motu proprio "Inter plurimas,"* Nov. 22, 1903), which have been confirmed by the *Codex* (c. 1264, No. 1), are still so poorly observed.

Let us state briefly that the sacred music must have for its purpose "to give greater efficacy to the liturgical text, and in this way more easily to incite the faithful to devotion." Therefore, while continuing to be a real art, it must exclude anything which would make it resemble the music of the theater, as well as the forms which are too characteristic of certain countries, and which are consequently devoid of that character of universality which befits the things that belong to the Church.

During the solemn functions (*Missa cantata,* Vespers, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament), it is forbidden to sing canticles in the vulgar tongue.

So-called *modern music* is not, as such, excluded from our churches provided that its compositions do not contain, even in their external forms, any thing that is theatrical or profane, and that they are, by their worth, their seriousness and dignity, worthy in every respect of the liturgical functions. Classic polyphony, however, is preferable, "especially that of the Roman school which, in the 16th century, attained the apogee of its perfection thru the work of Perluigi de Palestrina." The *Motu proprio* recommends it for the most solemn functions, especially in basilicas, cathedrals, and seminaries. But all the preferences of the Sovereign Pontiff are for the Gregorian chant; it is "the *special* chant of the Church. . . . the most perfect model of sacred music. . . . and all should be convinced that a religious service loses nothing of its solemnity when it is accompanied by no other music than this."

It is allowed to *support* the liturgical chants with an organ accompaniment; this accompaniment must never dominate the chant. *In certain particular cases and with the special authorization of the Ordinary,* it is allowed to use other instruments, "within just limits and with suitable precautions." For a special occasion the Ordinary may permit a limited selection of wind instruments ... provided that the composition and the accompaniment to be rendered are serious in style, seemly, and in every respect similar to the organ style of music." But "bands" must not be allowed in the church; and it is forbidden also to use in the church "the piano and other noisy and frivolous instruments, such as the drum, the bass drum, the cymbals, the triangle, etc."

450. These canticles in the vulgar tongue must not be the translation of the liturgical text; and they must have been duly approved.

451. It follows from this that prayers in the vulgar tongue are forbidden in the brief ceremonies of Benediction where the same ministers perform, with the same solemnity, the exposition and the reposition of the Blessed Sacrament. In order to be permitted to say these prayers, a distinction must be made between the two parts of the ceremony, and the exposition must be performed without solemnity. Thus, a priest in surplice and stole exposes the Blessed Sacrament, and then takes his place at the foot of the altar. When the office proper of the Benediction begins, he goes to the sacristy to receive the cope (or has it brought out to him by a server), or gives way to another priest wearing a cope and accompanied by sacred ministers. It is at this moment that the *solemn* function of Benediction and Reposition of the Blessed Sacrament begins, and from this time forth the prayers must be taken from the liturgy and sung or recited in Latin. (Cf. Haegy, Manuel de liturgie, I, p. 569.)

If there are other prayers than that of the Blessed Sacrament, they are to be said before the *Tantum Ergo.*

the priest, having sung *recto tono* and with the short conclusion the oration *Deus qui nobis* (to which no other oration is to be added), receives the humeral veil, goes up to the altar, makes a genuflection, takes the ostensorium (or receives it *standing* from the deacon), and gives the benediction by making a single sign of the cross over the faithful with the ostensorium.[452] Incensing during the benediction is optional.

After the benediction, the psalm *Laudate Dominum* may be sung, or other chants, even in the vulgar tongue, or invocations recited, also in the vulgar tongue, if desired.[453]

382. It is not forbidden, if the permission of the Ordinary is obtained, to give Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament several times the same day in the same church. However, this exercise of piety is not to be repeated too often (S. R. C., May 11, 1878.)

NOTE.—During the octave of Corpus Christi, on the day of the Perpetual Adoration (unless this falls on All Souls Day), and on the third day of the Forty Hours (the Mass of Reposition), it is allowed to say Mass at the altar where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed.[454]

Apart from these cases, a grave reason is required, or an indult from the Holy See; this reason may present itself more readily in churches where there is only one altar.

However, an immemorial custom may authorize a solemn Mass, or even a low conventual Mass before the Blessed Sacrament exposed. The desire of the Church is that such cases shall be very rare, and that permission shall be obtained from the Ordinary.

---

452. Regularly, benediction is given only once at each public exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. There is an exception for the procession of Corpus Christi, in the course of which it is allowed to give benediction once or twice; if there are other repositories, the processions halts at them for a moment, the priest incenses the Blessed Sacrament and says the prayer before going on.

453. It is the custom in certain countries to recite the invocations: *Blessed be God, etc.*, immediately *before* the Benediction. This custom may be retained (S.R.C., March 11, 1871, n. 3237).

454. A decree of the Congregation of Rites (May 10, 1890) also tolerates the custom of saying Mass before the Blessed Sacrament exposed on the occasion of a novena. During the sermon, if there is one, a veil must be placed before the exposition. Even when Mass is permitted, the distribution of Communion is forbidden at the altar of exposition (cf. n. 339, 7).

ALPHABETICAL INDEX

(*The figures refer to the paragraphs*)

Ablutions, 228, No. 2; at Masses of bination, 109, 114
Accidents, 4
Admission of children to First Communion, 312
Adoration, Perpetual, 377
Age for First Communion, 308
Alcohol (mixed with the Mass wine), 199
Aliquid per modum potus, 334, No. 4
Amice, 168
Altarcards, 181
Altarcloths, 173
Antimensia, 143
Antependium, 174
Application of the Mass, 19, 20;
  to whom may it be applied? 21
  application and celebration, 41 (note)
Assistant (priest), 100
Aurora, 118
Altar, 135
  fixed, 136
  portable, 137
  consecration, 140
  execration, 141
  titular, 142
  portable, 144
  privileged, 147
  Gregorian, 153
  furnishings, 173
  of the Blessed Sacrament, 352, 378
Bell, 182
Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, 372, 381
Binating, 110
  Purifying the chalice at Masses of bination, 114
Bishop
  powers anent Mass stipends, 47
  binating, 110
  the Reserved Sacrament, 350
  the Exposition of the B. Sacr., 373
  oratories, 128, 130
  the privileged altar, 151
  privilege of the private oratory, 126
  of the portable altar, 145
Blessing of a church, 120
  of oratories, 127, 128, 129
  of a tabernacle, 359
  of a ciborium, 364
  of vestments, 167
Burse for the corporal, 163 (note)
Bread, Eucharistic, 185, 194

Calotte, 90
Candles, 176, 372, 379
Candlesticks, 179
Cards, for the altar, 181
Carrying Communion, public or private, 251, 342
Cassock (necessary for saying Mass), 88

Celebration of Mass
by virtue of the sacerdotal character, 27
by virtue of an office, 30
by virtue of a benefice, 26, No. 1
by virtue of an honorarium, 44
by virtue of a promise, 26, No 4
thru obedience, 26, No. 3
in a non-sacred place, 132
at sea, 134
Celebret, 101
Censure, 91, 293
Chalice, 157
Chasuble, 170
Christmas, night of, 107, 119
Church, 120
Cincture, 169
Cloths, for the altar, 173
Colors, Liturgical, 171
Commerce in Masses, 61
Communion
fruits, 241
may one receive for others? 248
minister of, 249
nature of, 258
right to receive, 262
who are unworthy? 270
duty to receive, 277
Easter, 281, 301 (note)
dispositions for, 292
frequent, 318
in religious institutes, 332
of the sick, 251, 333
place of, 336
days for, 337
time of, 338
of children, 307, 328
ceremonies of, 339
Viaticum, 253, 288
Concelebration, 78
Confession (sacramental)
required before celebrating, 92
required before communicating, 294, 329
required for frequent communions, 329
Confessor (rôle of)
for frequent communions, 326
for the Communion of children, 312, 317
for frequent Communion as Viaticum, 291
for the Communion of the sick, 334, No. 3
Conopaeum, 357
Consecrate, power to, 14
Consecration
of the two species essential for sacrifice, 9, 184 (note)
words of, 210
doubtful, 208
Consecration
of churches, 120
of chalices, 158
Conservation of the Holy Eucharist
legitimate, 346
conditions, 347
obligatory, 348
permitted, 350
outside the tabernacle, 360
Continuity of the Mass, 235
Conventual Mass, 117 (note), 119 (note)
Corporal, 161
of the tabernacle, 357
Cross, of the altar, 175
Cruets, 182
Cushion, 182

Days, for celebrating, 104; for communion, 337
Deacon, extraordinary minister of Communion, 255
Dead (application of Mass to), 24
Masses for the dead, 219
Dedication of churches, 121 (note)
Delay in celebrating Masses, 65
Dispensation from Eucharistic fast
for the faithful, 299
for the priest, 86
Dispositions required for Communion
spiritual, 292
bodily, 298
for frequent Communion, 320
for children's Communions, 309
Doubtful (hosts, whose consecration is), 206, 208

Exchange of Mass intentions, 63
Effects
of the sacrifice, 11
of Communion, 240
Electricity in the church, 177, 366, 379
Epileptics, 267
Essence of the sacrifice, 8
Eucharist
nature, 1 et seq.
sacrifice, 7
sacrament, 239
Reserved Sacrament, 346
Excommunicated persons (application of Mass to), 21, No. 4
Execration
of a church, 122
of an altar, 141
of a chalice, 159
of a paten, 160
Exposition of the Bl. Sacrament, 371
private, 372
public, 373
Mass before Bl. Sacr. exposed, 382 (note); Faithful, their part in the offering of the sacrifice, 17; Fast, Eucharistic, 298
dispensation for the priest, 86
for the faithful, 299
for the sick, 333

Faults, in celebrating Mass, 228 et seq.
First Communion, 307
judgment concerning child's dispositions, 312; obligations of the parents, 316
Flowers, on the altar, 183, 379
Form of the Eucharist, 210
Forty Hours Adoration, 377
Frequent Communion, 318
Friday, Good, 104, 353
Fruits of the sacrifice, 10
to whom may they be applied? 22
fruits of Communion, 241

Good Friday, 104, 353
Grace, sacramental, of the Eucharist, 241
Gregorian Masses, 154

Haste in saying Mass, 231
Heretics, application of the Mass to, 21, No. 3
Holy Thursday, 105, 286, 337, 353

Holy Saturday, 106, 337
Honorariums, for Mass, 41 et seq.
transmission of, 52
commerce in, 61
in case of bination, 113
Hosts
matter, 195
form, 197
conditions for the validity and liceity of their consecration, 185, 194, 205, 209
must be freshly baked and frequently renewed, 368

Idiots, may they receive Communion? 266
Impetratory fruit, 10, No.1; 11
Indulgences and frequent Communion, 330
Indult
for reduction of Masses, 80
for votive and requiem Masses, 222
to reserve the Bl. Sacr., 351 (note)
Infidels, application of Mass to, 21, No. 3; 23, No. 3
Infirm, Communion of the, 333, 342
Insane, may they receive Communion? 264
Intention
for the application of the ministerial fruit, 20
secondary, 12
right, 323
Interruption of the Mass, 235
Irregularity ex defectu prevents celebration, 84

Key of Tabernacle, 361

Lamp, sanctuary, 365
Lights for the church, 176, 177, 366, 379
Linens, sacred, purification of, 165
Linens for the altar, 173
Liturgy of the Mass, 213
Lunula for the ostensorium, 362 (note)

Maniple, 170
Mass
notion, 7
efficacity, 11
species, 46
application, 19
binating, 110
days for celebrating, 104
obligation of saying, 27
time for, 117
place, for, 120
traffic in stipends, 61
foundations, 74
better to have Masses said while a person is living, 24, (note 3)
Mass pro populo
obligation, 30
days for celebrating, 33
nature of obligation, 36
dispensations and sanations, 39
Masses of Requiem, 219
Masses, Votive, 216
Material
for sacred vessels, 157
for sacred linens, 161
for sacerdotal vestments, 168
Matter of the Eucharist, 184, et seq.
Midnight, Mass, 119
Minister of the Eucharist, 249

Ministerial fruit, 10, No. 2; 11, No. 3; 21
Missal, 180
Music, sacred, 381 (note)

Obedience, celebration of Mass thru, 26, No. 3
Oblation, different from sacrifice, 17
Obligation
of celebrating Mass, 26
secondary obligations of celebrant, 64
of receiving Communion, 277, 281
of giving Communion, 335
of parents, confessor, pastor, regarding Communion of children, 316
Oratories, 125
Ornamentation of altar, 173, 355, 379

Pall, 162
Participation in several Masses, 10, No. 2 (note)
Particles, 208
Pastor, (rights and duties of)
for children's Communions, 312, 317
for the Easter Communions, 282, 285
for the Communion of the sick, 249, 251, 253
Paten, 160
Personal fruit, 10, No. 2; 11
Place
for saying Mass, 120 et seq.
for receiving Communion, 336
Pollution (num impedit Communionem vel Missae celebrationem?), 305
Pollution of a church, 123
Portable altar, 144
Possessed persons and the Eucharist, 267
Prayers after Mass, 228 (note)
Precipitation in saying Mass, 231
Preparation
for Communion, 297
for Mass, 95
Presence, Real, 2, 3
cessation, 239
duration, 260
Priest
obligation of saying Mass, 26; of giving Communion, 335
and the Eucharistic sacrifice, 13
value of Mass by a sinful priest, 15
by a priest separated from the church, 16
dispositions required for saying Mass, 83 et seq.
Priest, Assistant, 100
Private Mass, 23, No. 2
Privileged altar, 147
Promise to say Mass, 26, No. 4
Propitiatory fruit, 10, No. 1
Purgatory, application of Mass to souls in, 24
Purification
of ciborium, 370
of chalice in Masses of bination, 114
Purificator, 163

Quality of the Mass, 71, 214

Reconciliation of a church, 124
Rector of a church

rights and duties anent blessing of vestments, 161, 162 167
the key of the tabernacle, 361
permitting strange priest to celebrate, 101
Reduction of the number of Masses, 78
Refusing Communion, 270 et seq.
Register of Masses, 59, 76
Reliquaries, 183
Renewal of the Sacred Species, 368
Repository on Holy Thursday, 353
Requiem Masses, 219, 220, 222
Reserved Sacrament, 346 et seq. (See Conservation)
Ring, 90
Rites, for Communion, 340 et seq.
Rubrics, 223 et seq. The rubric de defectibus, 238, note

Sacrament
The Eucharist is a, 239
its effects, 240
Sacrifice
notion, 5
essence, 8
efficacity, 11
obligation of completing, 238
Sacrilegious Communion, 284, 294 (note)
Saints, Mass for the, 23
Satisfactory fruit, 10, No. 1
Saturday, Holy, 106, 337
Sea, saying Mass at, 134
Server, Mass, 97, 339, No. 6
Sick, Communion of the, 333, 342
Sin, forgiven by the Holy Eucharist, 10, 242
Sinners, unworthy to receive Communion, 270 et seq.
Soutane, necessary for saying Mass, 88
Special fruit, 10, No. 2
Species, sacramental, 4
their renewal, 368
Spiritual Communion, 258
Stipends, 41 et seq.
their transmission, 52
traffic in, 61
in case of bination, 113

Tabernacle, 356
Tax for Mass, 47
Thanksgiving, 297, 325 (note)
Thursday, Holy, 105, 286, 337, 353
Time, computation of, 299
Time, Easter, 283
Time
for receiving Communion, 339
for saying Mass, 33
Tone of voice in saying Mass, 233
Traffic in Masses, 61
Transubstantiation, 3
Trental, Gregorian, 154

Unleavened bread, 194, 339

Veil, 357
Vessels, sacred, 157, 164
Vestments, sacred, 166, 339, No. 4
Viaticum
obligation, 288
carrying of, 253
rite, 344

Vicar General
not bound to Missa pro populo, 32
Cannot fix the stipends for Masses, 47 (note)
cannot authorize the construction of a church, 120
cannot consecrate it, 121
cannot designate the privileged altar of each parish, 151
has not the privilege of the portable altar, 145
can authorize foundations of Masses, 75. No. 2
can issue celebrets, 101
can give permission to binate, 110
can give permission to bless vestments, 167
can give permission to reserve the Bl. Sacr., 350
can give permission to expose the Bl. Sacr., 373
can give permission to use a light other than olive oil, 366
Vomiting, 269
Votive Masses, 216
Votive Mass of the Sacred Heart, 217

Water, added to the Eucharistic wine, 199, 203
Washing of the stomach, 300. No. 2; 306
Wig, 89
Wine, Eucharistic, 191

Zuchetto, 90

265.3
D76

21,208

Durieux, Pierre

AUTHOR

The Eucharist (Law and Practice)

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED

265.3
D76